Patrick Rodgers 1825.

LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

BX 1780 .M678 O45 1821
O'Leary, Arthur, 1729-1802.
Miscellaneous tracts
SCC # 11,180

A DONATION
FROM
Rev. R. K. Rodgers D.D
Received Nov. 1874.

Imperfect: pp. 31-38 lacking

MISCELLANEOUS TRACTS,

BY THE

Rev'd A. Rodgers - 1825.

REV. ARTHUR O'LEARY.

CONTAINING

1. A Defence of the Divinity of Christ and the Immortality of the Soul: in answer to the Author of a work, lately published in Cork, entitled, "Thoughts on Nature and Religion." Revised and corrected.

2. Loyalty Asserted: or, a Vindication of the Oath of Allegiance; with an impartial Enquiry into the Pope's Temporal Power, and the present Claims of the Stuarts to the English Throne: proving that both are equally groundless.

3. An Address to the Common People of Ireland, on occasion of an apprehended Invasion by the French and Spaniards, in July, 1779, when the united fleets of Bourbons appeared in the Channel.

4. Remarks on a Letter written by Mr. Wesley, and a Defence of the Protestant Associations.

5. Rejoinder to Mr. Wesley's Reply to the above remarks.

6 Essay on Toleration: tending to prove that a man's speculative opinion ought not to deprive him of the Rights of Civil Society.

IN WHICH ARE INTRODUCED,

THE REV. JOHN WESLEY'S LETTER,

AND THE

DEFENCE OF THE PROTESTANT ASSOCIATIONS.

THE AUTHOR'S LETTERS TO THE BISHOP OF CLOYNE,

&c. &c. &c.

NEW-YORK:

PRINTED BY SAMUEL WALKER,

FOR D. SULLIVAN, 148, CHERRY-STREET.

1821.

TO THE

DIGNITARIES AND BRETHREN

OF THE ILLUSTRIOUS ORDER OF

THE MONKS OF ST. PATRICK.*

Rev. Fathers, and illustrious Brethren,

THE purport of the work which I have the honour to dedicate to your order, is to cement the bands of society; to secure the safety of our country, by union and mutual confidence; to render the subject's allegiance firm, and at the same time reasonable, by establishing it on its proper grounds; to dispel the mists of long reigning prejudice; after disarming infidelity, which strikes at the foundation of religion, and the dignity of our nature, to induce the Christians of every denomination to lay aside the destructive weapons which frenzy has so often put into their hands; and, under their peculiar modes of worship, to inspire them with that benevolence and charity enforced by the first principles of the Law of Nature, and confirmed by the sacred oracles which they all revere.

In my fugitive pieces, to which the circumstances of the times have given rise, you discovered the sincerity of my

* A society of nobles and gentlemen, composed of the greatest orators and writers in Ireland; who, unsolicited, have done the author the honour of adopting him as one of their members.

designs, in attempting to diffuse to the community at large, the influence of benignity. My feeble efforts have attracted your attention, and procured me the honour of your esteem. With regard to the rights of society, and protection due to the man who does not forfeit them by his misconduct, the learned, the virtuous, the liberal-minded of all denominations, make no distinction; but, with every respect due to religion, leave fanaticism, the noxious vermin that nestles in its wool, to prey upon the ulcerated heads of the bigots. Hence, neither my character of a Catholic Clergyman, which, in these kingdoms, the prepossession of ignorance has rendered so odious, nor the discountenance of the laws, which doom me to transportation, with the common malefactor, nor the disagreeable circumstances of a profession still exposed to the wanton lash of every religious persecutor, were deemed a sufficient plea for exclusion from a society composed of so many great and shining men.

Robertson's religion has proved no obstacle to his admission among the Spanish academicians. You, my brethren, have set the brilliant example of philanthropy in this kingdom; and soared far above the sphere of contracted minds. Happy for the world had the gentle voice of Nature been always listened to, and his religion forgotten in the man!

The calamities, of which a contrary conduct has been productive, are slightly glanced at in my treatise on toleration. In the two neighbouring kingdoms, the scenes which have been exhibited last year, are melancholy proofs, that a tolerating spirit, the fair offspring of candour and benevolence, confers happiness on individuals, and gives nations a bloom and vigour which intolerance blasts and enervates.

In consequence of the happy change in the dispositions of the people, Ireland has seen her peaceful natives employed in the useful labours of life; her citizens, confident in each other, improving trade and commerce, under a variety of difficulties; her judges respected on their tribunals; and the pleasing scenes of harmony and union spread through every province. Such the result of benevolence! Such the fruits of toleration! Such was our situation, when in Great Britain nothing could be seen but the course of public justice suspended, and martial law proclaimed; the law and the legislature trampled in their awful sanctuary; the torn canonicals of bishops, the lacerated robes of temporal peers, the streets ensanguined with the streaming blood of deluded victims; sumptuous edifices changed into blazing piles; the conflagration of Rome renewed by the torch of religious frenzy; the houses of inoffensive citizens chalked out for destruction; a city given up to plunder; assassins and malefactors let loose from their chains, and invited, by the hollow voice of fanaticism, to share the spoils; a king on the verge of destruction; a kingdom on the eve of being plunged into the calamities of civil war; the sword taking the place of the robe, and dictating to the violaters of the law; and the stern hand of justice succeeding, in its turn, to the sword, and sweeping from the face of the earth, the gleanings of military execution. Such the poisonous fruits of misguided zeal, and religious intolerance! The seeds of such disasters have been sown in distant times, when barbarity, or the competition of princes, contending for the throne, contributed to divide the people; and, from a mistaken policy, sovereigns themselves, in opposition to the maxims of legislation and wisdom, thought it more eligible to become heads of the half, than the fathers of all their subjects.

Such measures weakened their arms abroad, and will ever prove destructive at home. In every plain the English generals met with their fellow subjects, disputing the laurel, under the banners of kings who gave them encouragement.

The Catholic and Protestant powers on the Continent, by adopting a different plan, and uniting their subjects of every denomination in the ties of one common interest, strengthened their respective states against the encroachments of each other, and prevented their dominions from being changed a second time, into extensive fields of battle, covered with bodies, fallen by the sword of religious madness; or desolate wastes similar to those from whence restraints and distress have banished the human species: the present Emperor's mother restored her Christian subjects of every denomination, to the freedom and rights of citizens. The son has opened his calm bosom to the Jew, and is become the father of the man who blasphemes the Saviour whom his Sovereign adores. Ireland! Ireland, where the Protestant gentleman gives alms to the pilgrim without enquiring into his religion, and where the Catholic peasant presses his distressed fellow creature to take share of a handful of vegetables, scarce sufficient to support his own wretched existence: Ireland, whose generous sons have more compassion and feelings for the stranger, than their neighbours for the brothers of their blood—Ireland, where some strokes given by a peer of the realm, to a poor inoffensive priest in the last stage of a decay, which in a few days rescued him from the miseries of this life, "the "law's delay, and the proud man's contumely."—Ireland, where this scene raised such indignation in the generous breast of every Protestant, that a lawyer,* who to the

* Counsellor Curran.

powers of the orator joins the courage of the hero, without fee or reward, pleaded for obscurity against eminence, for weakness against power, and, after asserting the rights of humanity at the bar, went to encounter death in the field for a helpless client, in the last struggles of the agony. Ireland, so famous for the generous sentiments of her inhabitants, is the devoted spot, where out of a million and half of subjects, not one can become a coal measurer, a common soldier, an excise-man, nor have more than two apprentices at a time! Their dissenting brethren, so humane in their private characters, and the professors of whose religion are so tolerant in Holland and Switzerland, consider their Catholic neighbours as so many slaves ready to cut their throats, at the first signal given by their royal masters, without whose concurrence the chain could never have been fastened to their bodies. The kings of England, on the other hand, whose treasury would be better supplied by opulent subjects than by a million of naked and famished objects, are obliged, at an enormous expense, to hire foreign mercenaries of every religion, with their respective chaplains, whilst their dauntless subject, are forced to throw themselves into the arms of those sovereigns who pay them for fighting, and permit them to pray as they think fit.

Thus government is distressed on one hand, and the kingdom is deprived of its strength and internal resources on the other. The Catholics, between their fellow subjects and the throne, are like the forlorn hope between two armies. They are doomed to civil destruction between both.

Europe will soon bear a different aspect: and the examples set by those princes, who, for the aggrandizement

of their states, are doing away all religious distinctions, are so many warnings to copy after them. The Gauls, the Romans, the Carthaginians, thought themselves once invincible. Their divisions precipitated their downfal. No oracle has as yet declared that foreign candidates for glory and conquest will be deterred from attempting to become our masters. The power to resist becomes greater in proportion to the number of the subjects; in proportion to the stake they have to defend, their attachment to their country, their attachment to each other. A small state, rich, populous, and well united, is preferable to a large but divided kingdom. Let religious distinctions, then, be laid aside. It is equal to the Israelite, released from bondage, whether his temple be built by Solomon or Cyrus; provided he has liberty to pray unmolested, and to sleep under his vine and fig-tree. Diseases, sickness, death, which mows down the young and old, emigrations, the waste of war, countries, now unknown, which will be hereafter discovered, colonies that ever and always depopulate the parent state, rising empires, and princes inviting strangers to settle in their dominions, will leave land enough in Ireland, to the end of time, for ten times the number of its inhabitants.

The world is in a continual change. New monarchs sway the sceptre. New ministers direct their councils. New characters are daily mounting the stage of life, to become the object of applause, derision, or censure of mankind. Every new generation is a new world, raised on the ruins of the former, aiming at their present advantages, without any retrospect to past transactions, in which they are no ways concerned. We frequently change our bodies. Reason on its travels from age to age, acquires a new mode of thinking.

In a word, every thing is liable to change; and it is high time to change from division to union.

Let not religion, the sacred name of religion, which even in the face of an enemy discovers a brother, be any longer a wall of separation to keep us asunder: though it has been often perverted to the worst of purposes, yet it is easy to reconcile it with every social blessing.

In the course of this work, I intend to make it a citizen of the world, instead of confining it to one kingdom or province. I am not an able, neither am I a partial advocate. I plead for the Protestant in France, and for the Jew in Lisbon, as well as for the Catholic in Ireland. In future ages should fanaticism attempt to re-establish her destructive empire, and crying out with the frantic queen, *exoriare aliquis ex ossibus nostris*, summon the furies to spring from her embers, which I attempt to disperse and deprive of their noxious heat, let this votive offering, hung up in the temple of the order of the Monks of St. Patrick, announce to posterity, that in 1781, the liberal-minded of all denominations in Ireland, were reconciled, maugre the odious distinctions which the laws uphold, and that those very laws, enacted before we were born, but not the dispositions of the people, are the only sources of our misfortunes.

Whatever tends to promote the public good, is a tribute due from an adopted brother, to great and illustrious characters, whose refined feelings can only be equalled by the culture of their minds: who have transplanted to the Irish nursery the flowers of Rome and Athens: who, in their writings and speeches, have displayed to Europe

the scene of eloquence, diversified with the fire of Demosthenes and the majesty of Tully, and wrested their thunderbolts from those orators, in order to assert what they deemed the rights of mankind, and to crush the false divinities that should attempt to erect their altars on their ruins.

I have the honour to be,

Rev. Fathers, and

Illustrious Brethren,

Your affectionate Brother,

ARTHUR O'LEARY.

Dublin, July 15, 1781.

A

DEFENCE

OF THE

DIVINITY OF CHRIST:

OR, REMARKS ON A WORK, ENTITLED

THOUGHTS ON NATURE AND RELIGION.

LETTER I.

TO THE AUTHOR.*

SIR,

YOUR long expected performance has at length made its appearance. If the work tended to promote the happiness of society; to animate our hopes; to subdue our passions; to instruct man in the happy science of purifying the polluted recesses of a vitiated heart; to confirm him in his exalted notion of the dignity of his nature, and thereby to inspire him with sentiments averse to whatever may debase the excellence of his origin; the public would be indebted to you; your name would be recorded amongst the assertors of morality and religion; and I myself, though bred up in a different persuasion from yours, would be the first to offer my incense at the shrine of merit. But the tendency of your performance is to deny the divinity of Christ, and the immortality of the soul. In denying the first, you sap the foundations of religion; you cut off, at one blow, the merit of our faith, the comfort of our hope, and the motives of our charity. In denying the immortality of the soul, you degrade human nature, and confound man with the vile and perishable insect. In denying both, you overturn the whole system of religion, whether natural or revealed: and in denying religion, you deprive the

* A Scotch physician, who styles himself Michael Servetus.

poor of the only comfort which supports them under their distresses and afflictions; you wrest from the hands of the powerful and rich, the only bridle to their injustices and passions; and pluck from the hearts of the guilty, the greatest check to their crimes; I mean, this remorse of conscience, which can never be the result of a handful of organized matter; this interior monitor which makes us blush, in the morning, at the disorders of the foregoing night! which erects in the breast of the tyrant, a tribunal superior to his power, and whose importunate voice upbraids a Cain, in the wilderness, with the murder of his brother; and a Nero, in his palace, with that of his mother. Such are the consequences naturally resulting from the principles laid down in your writings.

It is no intention of mine to fasten the odium of wilful infidelity on any person, who professes his belief in the Scriptures: though I am equally concerned and surprised that a gentleman, whose understanding has been enlightened by the Christian revelation, and enlarged by all the aids of human learning, should broach tenets, which equally militate against the first principles of reason, and the oracles of the Divinity; and which, if true, would be of so service to mankind. Whoever is so unhappy as to work himself into a conviction, that his soul is no more than a subtile vapour, which in death is to be breathed out into the air, to mix confusedly with its kindred element, and there to perish, would still do well to conceal his horrid belief with more secrecy than the Druids concealed their mysteries. In doing otherwise, he only brings disgrace on himself: for the notion of religion is so deeply impressed on our minds, that the bold champions who would fain destroy it, are considered by the generality of mankind, as public pests, spreading disorder and mortality wherever they appear; and in our feelings we discover the delusions of a cheating philosophy, which can never introduce a religion more pure than that of the Christians, nor confer a more glorious privilege on man, than that of an immortal soul. In a word, if it be a crime to have no religion, it is a folly to boast of the want of it.

Whence, then, this eagerness to propagate systems, the tendency whereof is to slacken the reins that curb the irregularity of our appetites, and restrain the impetuosity of passion? In our dogmatizing philosophers, it must proceed

from the corruption of the heart, averse to restraint; or the vanity of the mind, which glories in striking from the common path, and not thinking with the multitude.

Your unspotted character justifies you from any imputation of a design to infect others with the poison of a licentious doctrine. But vanity is one of those foreign ingredients, blended by the loss of original justice, into our nature. It prefers glorious vices to obscure virtues. It animates the hero to extend his conquests, at the expense of justice; and stimulates the philosopher to erect the banners of error on the ruins of truth. You seem to acknowledge it, in your enquiries into the causes of error: 'It was vanity in philosophers 'which caused so many different sects and systems.' I believe it, and Montaigne was of the same opinion. Immersed in an ocean of disorders, glorying in appearance, in an utter extinction of remorse, and conversant with the doctrine taught in Epicurus's garden, he acknowledges, that 'vanity induces 'free-thinkers to affect more impiety than they are really capable of.' Lucretius, in like manner, whose arguments against the immortality of the soul are the same with yours, corroborates your opinion, relative to the bias vanity gives those soaring and philosophical geniuses, who strike from the trodden path. When in glowing numbers he enforced his fond opinion of careless goods and material souls, as favourable to the calm repose which the voluptuous bard, who makes his invocation to Venus, would fain enjoy without remorse here, or punishment hereafter, he was well aware that his doctrine clashed with the general sense of mankind. But the philosophical poet consoles himself, with the flattering expectation of gratifying his vanity:

> "'Tis sweet to crop fresh flowers, and get a crown,
> "For new and rare inventions of my own."*

In a word, some men of learning plume themselves upon the singularity of their opinions: and, however they may disclaim vanity, as the spring of their literary performances, yet it is one of those ingredients which gives a zest to their composition. And if singularity and novelty of invention, be stimulatives to self-love, few authors of the age are more

* Creech's Lucretius.

bound to guard against this dangerous and agreeable poison, than the author of the '*Thoughts on Nature and Reli-*
'*gion.*'

To range those singularities under their proper heads, is almost impossible: and modesty does not permit to transcribe from your book several passages of your allegorical commentary, on the second chapter of Genesis. 'The coat of skins,' then, 'with which God covered the man and woman after their fall,' as well as 'the fruit so pleasing to the eye, which the woman tasted,' I leave the doctor in full possession of. He is a married man, and skilled in the anatomy of all *parts* of the body.

After giving his readers the important information, that Adam was displeased with his wife, for inducing him to a *faux pas*, which I believe no married man, except Adam, (if we believe the doctor,) ever scrupled; he allegorizes some of the rest of the chapter, in the following manner: 'God 'planted a garden eastward in Eden,' says the inspired writer, 'and there he put the man whom he had formed.' 'What is called a garden,' says the doctor, 'I take to be 'the human mind. By the river which watered the garden, 'and afterwards divided into four branches, is meant inno-'cence, divided into the four cardinal virtues.' Here he loses breath: for to allegorize all would be too tedious; and doubtless the public have room to regret the doctor's omission in not continuing the allegory to the end of the chapter.

He professes his belief in the Scriptures; but has the good luck to elude every difficulty that falls in his way, by the assistance of metaphors; and thinks himself the more authorized to take this freedom with Moses, as he discovers a mistake in the Bible. 'I will strike Egypt, saith 'the Lord, from the tower of Syene to the borders of 'Ethiopia.'* 'Instead of Ethiopia,' says the doctor, 'it 'should be Arabia: for Syene was situated on the borders 'of Ethiopia.'

Pray, doctor, does a mistake in geography, on the part of the translators of the Bible, invalidate the Mosaical account of man's innocence, together with his felicity in Paradise;

* Ezechiel.

the malice of the tempting spirit, and his appearance under the form of a serpent; the fall of Adam and Eve, fatal to all their posterity; the first man justly punished in his children, and mankind cursed by God; the first promise of redemption, and the future victory of man over the Devil, who had undone them? Has not the memory of those great events, and the fatal transition from original justice to the corruption of sin, been preserved in the golden and iron ages of the poets, their Hesperian gardens watched by dragons, and in the enchantments and worship of idolatrous nations, in whose incantations and superstitions, the serpent always bore, as it bears still, a principal part? Allegorize Moses as much as you please; he relates that God promised, that 'the woman's 'offspring would crush the serpent's head.' This very promise of a Redeemer, and man's victory through his grace, are foretold in the oracles of the Gentiles. Even Tacitus, though a mortal enemy to the Jews and Christians, acknowledges that it was a constant tradition among the Oriental nations, that from the Jews would spring a conqueror, who would subdue the world. A translator's mistake, as to the name of a town or tower, is no plea for scepticism; especially as there are and have been, several towns of the same name, in different places; which might have been the case with *Syene;* and cities which, in a long succession of time, have changed their names, or borne different names at the same time: as is the case with Constantinople, which the Turks call Stamboul, and others Byzantium.

But let us suppose that the tower of Syene was situated on the same line, in an opposite direction, with the frontiers of Ethiopia: is there any impropriety in saying, 'I will strike 'Egypt from the tower of Syene to the borders of Ethiopia?' Solinus relates, that there was a tower, called Syene, in lower Egypt. Ethiopia borders Egypt on the south. In striking Egypt, then from the tower of Syene to the borders of Ethiopia, it is struck from north to south: that is, from one extremity to the other. The doctor, then, has lost his time in correcting the prophet Ezechiel's map, and substituting Arabia for Ethiopia. Yet this passage of Ezechiel is his chief plea for allegorizing Genesis: with what success let the reader judge.

A warm fancy, in a paroxysm of zeal, may indulge its

boundless excursions in the path of allegory, when obscure passages and mystical expressions open a field for interpretations and allusions. Mead, Whiston, Wesley, and the doctor himself, may discover the Pope in the beast with ten horns; and Rome in the great city built on seven hills. The Jewish rabbins, after obtaining permission from the prince of Orange to build a synagogue, applied to their benefactor this famous passage of Isaiah: 'On that day seven women will take hold 'of one man,' alluding to the Seven United Provinces that had elected him stadtholder: and I myself, if I were in humour, could, in a long-winded discourse, enlarge upon the seven sacraments, or the three theological and four cardinal virtues; and compare them to the seven golden candlesticks mentioned in the revelations of St. John. But in an historical narration, giving an account of the origin of the world: of a garden planted with trees, watered with four rivers; with their names; the countries through which they flow; the precious stones, mines, and minerals, to be found in those countries, &c.: the introduction of an allegory is the subversion of reason.

Even where allegories can be used with any propriety, our masters in rhetoric lay down as a rule, that, 'in the chain of 'metaphors continued through the discourse, aptness, resem- 'blance, and justness of allusion, must be strictly observed.' What justness of allusion is there between the *human mind*, and *a garden planted eastward in Eden, where God put the man he had created?* As much as there is in saying, *God made man, and placed him eastward in his mind.* What analogy is there between the *four rivers* and the *four cardinal virtues?* Between *fortitude* and *Pison*, or the *Ganges*, with the effiminate natives that inhabit its banks? Between *prudence* and the *Euphrates? Justice* and *Gihon* or the *Nile*, with its crocodiles? *Temperance* and *Hiddekel* or the *Tygris*, which, as Moses relates, and as geography informs us, *goeth towards the east of Assyria*, a country famous in former days for the intemperance of its inhabitants? The four cardinal virtues being set afloat on the four rivers, and the doctor's imagination having spent the fire of his allegory, we are at a loss what virtue to describe by the onyx-stone mentioned by Moses in the following words: 'The name of the first river is Pison; that is 'it which compasseth the land of Havilah, where there is

'is gold: and the gold of that land is good: and there is 'bdellium and the onyx-stone.' By *gold*, doubtless, he must mean *charity* or *patience*. But of the *onyx-stone* there are four kinds; and we would be obliged to our dogmatizing philosophers for describing their four correspondent virtues.

Let them inform us, in like manner, whether the *bdellium* mentioned by Moses, be one of the *theological* or a branch of the *cardinal* virtues. For though in dispensatories, the bdellium be allowed to be a good nostrum, of an emollient and discutient quality; yet the learned, whether commentators of Scripture, or natural philosophers, are no more agreed about the true nature of bdellium, than they are about the manner how it is produced: and it is much doubted whether the bdellium of the ancients be the same with the modern kind.

Thus, in the disputes about a drop of gum resin, the nature and production whereof perplex the most learned, we discover the weakness of human reason. We cannot dissect a fly; and we would fain comprehend the ways of Providence. We would fain sound the unfathomable ocean of the Christian religion, and arraign its mysteries at the tribunal of a glimmering reason; when the small atom that swims on the surface, baffles our severest scrutiny.

I have the honour to be, &c.

ARTHUR O'LEARY.

LETTER II.

SIR,

TO our modern philosophers, who set up the proud idols of their own fancies in opposition to the oracles of the divinity, and, endeavouring to discover absurdities in the Christian religion, fall into greater, we can, without disclaiming our title to good manners, apply what St. Paul applied to the philosophers of his time: 'they became vain in 'their imaginations: professing themselves to be wise, they 'became fools.' In order to sap the foundations of revealed religion, and to make man the sport of chance, who neither lost any privilege by Adam's fall, nor gained any thing by Christ's redemption, they endeavour to obtrude Moses on the public as an allegorical writer. Examine his character, and acknowledge their folly.

Besides his divine mission, in what historian, does truth shine more conspicuous? He relates his personal defects, as well as the extraordinary powers with which the Lord invested him; deduces a long chain of patriarchs from the first man down to his days; traces a genealogy, in which every chief is distinguished by his peculiar character. In quitting Egypt, the nursery of fiction, did it comport with the dignity of the legislator and commander of a chosen people, to write romances? In the space of five hundred years, from Noah's death to Moses' time, could the fall of man and his expulsion from Paradise be forgotten? And, as he had enemies, would not they have charged him with imposture? Or was he the only person amongst the Jews, who was instructed by his father? In a word, it was out of his power to deceive the Jews; much less was it his inclination or interest. All, then, is coherent in Moses: and to his genuine narrative we are indebted for the knowledge of ourselves; for, without the aid of revelation, man would ever be an inexplicable mystery.

In believing my descent from a father created in a state of perfection, from whence he fell; a father on whose obedience or disobedience my happiness or misery depended; I

can account for the corruption of my nature, and all the train of evils which have descended to Adam's children. Without this clue to direct me, I must be for ever entangled in a labyrinth of perplexities. Let philosophy glory in levelling man with the brute, and say that there was never any difference in his state; that he was always the same, destined to gratify his appetites, and to die;—I am really persuaded that I must renounce common sense, if I believe that man is now the same that he was in coming from his Maker's hands. The opposition between our passions and reason is too palpable, to believe that we were created in such an excess of contradictions. Reason dictates to be temperate, just, and equitable; to deal with others as I would fain be dealt by; not to infringe the order of society; to pity and relieve the afflicted: my passions, those tyrants so cruel, prompt me to raise myself on the ruin of others; to tread in the flowery paths of criminal pleasures; and to sacrifice my enemy to my resentment. If God, then, be the author of reason,—and that it is granted to man to regulate and curb his inclinations,—misery and corruption were not our primitive state.

Philosophers, in a strain of irony, may deride our Bible and Catechism, and laugh at our folly for believing that an apple could entail such miseries on mortals: but let them seriously consider the multitude and greatness of the evils that oppress us; and how full of vanity, of illusions, of sufferings, are the first years of our lives; when we are grown up, how are we seduced by error, weakened by pain, inflamed by lust, cast down by sorrow, elated with pride:——and ask themselves, whether the cause of those dreadful evils be the injustice of God or the original sin of man?

The evidence of those miseries forced the pagan philosophers to say, that we were born only to suffer the punishments we had deserved for crimes committed in a life before this. They, doubtless, were deceived as to the origin and cause of our miseries: but still some glimmering of reason did not permit them to consider those calamities as the natural state of man. But religion reforms the error, and points out, that this heavy yoke, which the sons of Adam are forced to bear, from the time their bodies are taken from their mothers' womb, to the day that they are to return to the womb of their common mother, the earth, would not

have been laid upon them, if they had not deserved it, by the guilt they contract from their origin.

But religion, as far as it includes mysteries, you think yourself at liberty to discard; because you 'cannot conceive 'how God could require of man, a belief of any thing which 'he has not endowed him with powers to conceive.'* Hence you reject the mystery of the Trinity, as an invention of the clergy, borrowed from the poetical fable of the three brothers, Jupiter, Neptune, and Pluto; the Divinity of Christ, as an imposition of the clergy: and the immortality of the soul, as the invention of scholastic subtlety.

You think the religion of nature a sufficient guide; and prefer Socrates and Cato to the clergy of the Christian religion,—the great Cato whom you applaud for his bon mot, when he said, that he was surprised *how two priests could meet without bursting out into a fit of laughter.* Do not confide too much, my dear Sir, *in reason and this boasted law of nature,* which formed an Aristides, a Socrates, a Cato, whom you applaud *for laughing at priests.* Whatever tricks or juggles might have been played in the recesses of the Capitol, where the Sibylline oracles were deposited, to answer the purposes of state,—to animate the people to war, from an expectation of success, under the protection of Jupiter or Apollo,—and to support the pride and policy of Roman grandeur;—the priests of the Christian religion do not conceal their belief. Cato might laugh in seeing his colleague, for reasons best known to themselves: and doubtless, the priest, who came to the Roman lady, with a message from Apollo, informing her that the god intended to honour her that night with his company, by sleeping with her in his temple, laughed heartily in seeing the young gentleman who bribed him to the cheat, and the more so, as on the day following the lady gave the public to understand, that however great Apollo might have been, in his quality of God, honoured with altars and temples, he had nothing extraordinary in his quality of companion. Cato's *priests* then might have laughed in seeing one another; the mysteries and rites of their Gods, as debauched and corrupt as themselves, afforded scenes of impure mirth: and the Christian clergy are obliged to the Doctor for putting them and the three *brothers*, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,

* Thoughts on Nature and Religion, page 127.

whom they worship, on a level with the heathen priests and their Jupiter, who ravished Ganymedes, Neptune and his sea nymphs, and Pluto, who carried off Proserpina.

In spite of the preference, given by the Doctor to Cato and Socrates, over the Christian clergy, and the sufficiency of the law of nature to regulate the conduct of man, we can assure him, that under the direction of a Christian mother, who never *studied philosophy*, a child imbibes sublimer notions of divinity, and purer ideas of virtue, than Plato ever taught in the academy, or Aristotle in the Lyceum. What were those boasted sages whom our modern Free-thinkers so often introduce on the stage, as paragons of wisdom, in order to play the dazzling glass in the eyes of the unwary, by making reason their only oracle, and painting religion as priest-craft? Some doubted of their own existence, and consequently of the existence of a God. Some figured to themselves an indolent God, who never concerned himself in the affairs of mortals, equally indifferent about vice or virtue; who, to use the words of Lucretius, 'ne'er smiles at good, 'ne'er frowns at wicked deeds.' Some considered the Supreme Being as the slave of destiny. Others as incorporate with the universe, and a part of a world which is the work of his hand.

What extravagant notions concerning the nature of the soul! In one school it was an assemblage of atoms; in another it was subtile air; in a third school it was a *something* which, after its separation from one body, entered into another, roaming from heaven to earth and from earth to heaven, without any permanent abode; alternately swaying the sceptre of authority in the hands of the monarch, and animating the body of a beast of burden. Their great remedy against the terrors of death, consisted in a false but flattering way of reasoning. 'Either the soul dies with the 'body, or survives it. If it dies with the body it cannot suf-'fer. If it survives it, it will be happy.' Not reflecting that the horrors of sin, and infinite justice, may appoint an intermediate state, wherein man is eternally miserable. Hence all the reins were slackened, and the most abominable crimes honoured with priests, altars, and temples. Public worship became a public prostitution. Incest, impurity, drunkenness, hatred, pride, were deified under the fictitious names of Ju-

piter, Juno, Venus, Mars, &c. and criminal Gods were worshipped with crimes.

It was not the mountain inhabited by the rude and uncivilized, which alone was polluted with the smoak of profane incense: the nations most renowned for learning and refinement,—Romans, Greeks, and Egyptians,—in the midst of their cities, saw sumptuous edifices consecrated to the passions which the Gospel condemns. By their mistakes and errors it is easy to perceive the weakness of reason, and the necessity of revealed religion.

Your philosophers whom our modern free-thinkers are ever extolling, with a view to degrade the Christian religion and its ministers, never escaped the general contagion.—Your Cato, besides suicide, was guilty of levities *of a softer nature* than the steel with which he killed himself. Your Socrates, whom you would fain obtrude on the ignorant, as *a martyr to truth and the original religion of nature*, acknowledges in his defence, that he worshipped the Gods of his city, and was seen on public festivals sacrificing at their altars. His wrestling naked with his pupil, Alcibiades, was an attitude ill suited to the character of a man, entitled to a place in the calendar of saints. What shall I say of the Cynics, who laid aside all the natural restraints of shame and modesty? Of Chrysippus, the advocate of intermarriages between fathers and daughters? Of the Persian Magi, who married their mothers? Of Seneca, playing the moralist in public, debauching his sovereign's wife in private, and preferring his pretended wise man to God himself? What shall I say of the *divine Plato*, who annihilates the institution of connubial ties? Who by introducing a community of women, and refusing the husband any exclusive property in the marriage bed, would fain introduce a horrid confusion amongst men; confound all paternal rights, which nature itself respected, and people his republic with inhabitants, uncertain of their origin, without tenderness, affection, or humanity; whereas in such a state it would have been impossible for the son to know his father.

Such is the boasted *reason* you take for your guide, and lo, the great luminaries it has produced! A set of proud men, bewildered in a labyrinth of the most monstrous errors. If our modern philosophers are more refined than those ancient

sages, it is to the Christian religion, which they would fain overthrow, to the writings of its doctors, whom they deride, and to the first principles of a Christian education, which they cannot entirely forget, that they are indebted for their superiority.

Before revealed religion dispelled the mist, reason was overspread with error, in the breasts of the greatest men. It is no more than a bare capacity to be instructed; an engine veering at every breath; equally disposed to minister to vice as well as to virtue, according to the variety and customs of different climates. It did not hinder the Egyptian from worshipping leeks and onions, nor the Athenian, Socrates, from offering a cock to Esculapius.

But is man to be debarred the use of his reason, or has he any thing to dread for not believing mysteries he cannot comprehend? Make full use of your reason, not with a design to fall into scepticism, but with a sincere desire to come at the knowledge of the truth. Reason is never better employed than in discovering the will of its author: and when once we discover that it is his will we should believe, reason itself suggests that it is our duty to submit; otherwise we are guilty of rebellion against the first of sovereigns: and to deny his power to punish the disobedience of his creatures, is more than you have attempted.

This important enquiry should be attended with a pure heart and fervent prayer. However a philosopher may laugh at the hint, *as Cato would laugh if he met a priest.* It was after a fervent prayer Solomon received his wisdom: after a fervent prayer, Cornelius the Centurion, obtained the privilege of becoming the first convert from amongst the Gentiles. Even the heathen, Democritus, who figured so much amongst the literati of his time, constantly prayed the Gods to send him good images. Religion would not seem so absurd, the number of free-thinkers would not be so great, if we made it our business to purify the heart, and earnestly to beg of the Divinity to enlighten our understanding. For the passions of the heart, and too much confidence in ourselves, pave the way for the errors of the mind. Solomon became dissolute and voluptuous before he fell into idolatry. We ever and always lose our innocence before we laugh at our catechism.

But a philosopher requires argument, and leaves prayer to the vulgar. Reason is too precious a gift to be offered at the shrine of religion: yet from St. Paul, to whom the Roman governor said that too much learning had turned his head, down to John Locke, the great historian of the human understanding, the greatest men the world ever produced, have believed mysteries beyond their comprehension. They all knew that God cannot lie, nor deceive mortals, but that man is liable to error. If then my reason discovers, that the motives of credibility are sufficient to induce me to believe, that God has proposed such and such a doctrine; the same reason immediately whispers, *believe your God, for he can do more than you can comprehend.*

In denying mysteries, because we cannot comprehend them, we may as well deny our existence. For our very existence is a mystery we can never comprehend. How many valves and springs, how many veins and arteries, what an assemblage of bones, muscles, canals, juices, nerves, fluids, tubes, vessels, are requisite to make that frail being called man? Great partizans of *nature and reason* (words often used to veil your ignorance), take a handful of dust and shape it in the figure of a man, bore the veins and arteries, lay the sinews and tendons, fit the joints and blow into its nostrils your *philosophical breath*, make it move, walk, speak, concert plans, form schemes; make it susceptible of love, fear, joy, hope, desire, &c. then we will recognize your comprehensive knowledge of the imperceptible progress, and divine mechanism of the human frame. For the formation of each of us is as wonderful as the formation of the first. Your very bodies of which you are so fond, are *mysteries* in which your reason is lost; and you would fain have a religion which proposes nothing but what your reason comprehends. Thousands of years elapsed before Harvey discovered the circulation of the blood. Thousands will elapse before the delicate texture of the human frame is known.

Disengage yourselves, if you can, from the impenetrable folds and darkness of our own frames. Take a survey of all the objects that surround you; you plunge into an abyss overspread with darkness and obscurity. Explain to us how one and the same water paints and dyes the different flowers into various colours, the pink, the lilly, the tulip, the rose;

or how from an inodorous earth they draw their sweet perfumes! The cell of the bee, which that little insect makes according to the nicest rules of geometry, without studying the mathematics, and in the construction whereof the curious have observed all the advantages which geometers derive from Newton's doctrine of fluxions, the minima and maxima, and the extraordinary contrivance, whereby a less quantity of surface is sufficient to contain a given quantity of honey, which saves that creature much wax and labour. The cell of the bee, the granary of the ant, the heart, lungs, liver, &c. of the mite, baffle your learned researches.

From the immense bodies swimming in the azure fluid above, to the blade of grass which springs under your feet, every thing is a *mystery* to man.

If you range in the boundless region of the abstract sciences, what a fathomless ocean of truths which you must acknowledge, without comprehending! Lines eternally drawing near to each other, without ever meeting! Motion for ever slackening, without ever coming to a point of rest! The infinite divisibility of matter, whereby a small grain of wheat incloses in itself as many parts (though lesser in proportion) as the whole world! The smallest part of the same grain containing another world, and the least part of that part, as small, with respect to the grain, as the grain is, with respect to the entire frame of the universe, and so on, to infinity!

If, then, the vigour of our wit must yield to an atom of matter, is it not an abuse of reason, to refuse our assent to truths propounded by an all-wise and omnipotent Being, only because they are above our conception?

If nature be, then, a mysterious Book, closed up with a seven-fold seal, is it not presumption and blindness in man not to submit to unerring wisdom? Revealed religion once secluded, a faint light and lame kind of liberty would be our boasted privilege. Wounded man could never find, in his reason, sufficient light to discover the truths of eternal life; nor in his liberty, sufficient strength to follow their dictates. Like the bleeding traveller, on the road of Jericho, he stands in need of the assistance of some foreign and healing hand.

'It is none of his fault,' says St. Austin, who had himself been a proud and voluptuous Philosopher, 'if he cannot make 'use of his broken limbs: but he is guilty, if he despises the

'physician who proffers to cure him: and he is humbly to 'acknowledge his weakness, to obtain help. This assistance 'is ministered, not by the law of nature, but by the *tree of* '*life*, who says of himself: I am the vine: you are the 'branches: without me you cannot do any thing.'

The two fatal springs of our evils, are—the error of the mind, and the infirmity of the will. In him we find the remedy: the light of revelation to dispel our darkness, and his enlivening grace to purify the heart. You are ready to acknowledge him as the divine and inexhaustible fountain of both, if once some passages, which, in your opinion, militate against his Divinity, could be reconciled. An attempt shall be made in my next letter.

I have the honour to be, &c.

ARTHUR O'LEARY.

LETTER III.

SIR,

AN incarnate God, whose bleeding wounds have paid our ransom, is one of those mysteries that stuns and disconcerts human reason, liable to stray through the winding paths of roving error, if the clew of faith do not direct our steps and minister its assistance. He appeared on earth to cancel our crimes; to nail to the cross the schedule of our condemnation; to lacerate and tear the woeful hand-writing that gave us over to rebel angels; to snatch sinful man from the hands of divine justice; and to unlock the awful gates of the eternal sanctuary, whither no mortal has access, but through the blood of the spotless Pontiff. He appeared, in fine, to raise, through his merits, all those who fell by Adam's guilt; to form a faithful and holy people, a faithful people, 'by capti-'vating their understanding to the yoke of faith,' and a holy people, whose conversation, according to St. Paul, ought to be in heaven; and who are to follow no longer the dictates of the flesh.

Our ignorance of his nature would expose us to the fatal alternative—either of becoming idolaters in worshipping a man, which is the case of all Christians, if your opinion be well grounded, or of refusing God the homage that is due to him, which is your case, if you mistake and err. If Christ be not God, the Christians are in the same case with the idolatrous Tartars, who worship a living man: and if he be God above all, and blessed for ever, you may as well believe the Alcoran, as believe the Scriptures; and invoke Mahomet, as invoke the son of Mary. He declares, 'that life eternal 'consists in the knowledge of Himself, and of the Father who 'sent him.' In such an important article, it is too hazardous to plead ignorance, in hopes of impunity: for the Scripture says, that 'there is a way which man thinks to be the right 'one; and the end thereof are the ways of death.' The Divinity of Christ, evidenced by the accomplishment of so many oracles, and supported by the concurrent testimonies of all nations and ages, since his appearance on earth, has so many

apologists, that the doctor can easily meet with some of them in every library, and, I doubt not, in his own; and that it were presumption in me to attempt going over the same ground; especially, after what Abadie and Houteville have said on this important subject. Moreover, Sir, you acknowledge the authenticity of the Scriptures; and found your doubts, either on the obscurity of some passages, or the misapplication of some prophecies, or the numberless texts, relating to Christ's humanity. In this walk, I take the liberty of attending you, step by step; and shall avoid, as much as possible, any long digression; lest we may stray too far from the path.

OBSCURITY.

You affirm, that the first chapter of St. John, in which the Divinity of Christ is asserted, 'In the beginning was the 'Word; and the Word was with God; and the Word was 'God;' is intricate and obscure. It is quite the reverse; and Christ's Divinity cannot be read in more legible characters. You understand by the *Word*, 'the Man Jesus, whom God 'raised up in time, and to whom God imparted extraordinary 'gifts.' In understanding by the *Word*, the *Man Jesus*, you are in similar circumstances with king Agrippa, who said: 'Paul, Paul, you have made me almost a Christian.' You would be entirely a Christian, if you added to 'the Man Jesus, whom God raised up in time,' *the God Jesus, who was begotten from eternity:* according to the saying of the Psalmist, 'before the morning star I have begotten thee:' words which Christ applies to himself. Or you understand by the foregoing words, 'In the beginning was the word,' &c. *truth and righteousness, co-eternal with the Divinity.* Permit me to tell you, that you explain one obscurity by another; and that, notwithstanding all your shifts, either the Evangelist did not know what he was saying, or you must absolutely allow an eternal and pre-existent principle, united to human nature, 'in the fulness of time.'

To prove what I advanced, I shall adopt your interpretation, and place *truth* in the room of *word*. 'In the begin-'ning was the *truth*; and the *truth* was with God: and *God* '*was the truth.*' Remark, here, that *God* and the *truth* are identified:—*God was the truth.* In the same chapter, it is

said: 'the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.' In adopting your interpretation, it will be: 'the *truth* was made 'flesh and dwelt among us,' viz. the same *truth* of which he said before, that it was God himself; and then the entire sense will be, *God, the truth, was made flesh, and dwelt amongst us.* Upon the whole, you are to acknowledge an eternal, pre-existent principle, assuming human nature; or to reject this chapter as suppositious, which no Arian or Socinian ever did.

You accuse the English translators of some design, in transposing these words, 'Καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λογος, 'And God was 'the Word,' which they have Englished, 'and the Word 'was God,' as if they intended to promote the Christian cause by an artful transposition.

I see no advantage you can derive from so severe and injurious an intimation. Whether we say, 'God was the 'Word,' or 'the Word was God,' the sense is the same: for, in all languages, it is the nature of the copulative verb (is) to identify the predicate and the subject, if it be not followed by some exclusive particle or negative word. *Peter was or is that man:* transpose the words, and such will be the result of the transposition: *that man was or is Peter.* The sense is the same in both cases: and the same may be said, and is true, whether we say, 'God was the Word,' or 'the 'Word was God.'

This chapter is as clear as the first chapter of St. Paul's epistle to the Colossians, wherein he sets forth and extols the qualities of our divine Redeemer, 'by whom were made all 'things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible; 'whether thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: 'all things were created by him and in him: and he is before 'all: and all things subsist in him.'*

If all things, that are, were made by him, he himself was not made: and his divine power is signified, when it is said, 'all things subsist,' or are preserved by him.

Further: critics lay down a general rule, whereby to elucidate the sense and meaning of authors, viz. to know the time in which they lived; the circumstances in which they wrote; and the adversaries with whom they were engaged. The application of the rule evinces the literality of the first

* Verse 16, 17.

chapter of St. John, which puzzled and perplexed the Arians and Socinians, and exhausted the metaphysics of the subtle Crellius. St. John wrote his gospel at the request of the Asiatic bishops, in opposition to the false doctrine of Ebion and Cerinthus, who denied the divinity of the Son of God. Motives, circumstances, the nature of the question, the doctrine of his adversaries, all concur to prove that he is to be understood in a literal sense: a sense so free from any mysterious obscurity, that the Platonic philosophers, according to St. Austin, discovered, in this chapter, the Divinity of the Son of God. 'But they were too proud,' says this father, 'to acknowledge the lowness of his humanity.'

SECOND OBSCURITY.

To invalidate our belief of Christ's conception in a virgin's womb, you oppose St. Matthew, who says, 'that 'Jacob was father to Joseph, the husband of Mary,' to St. Luke, who says, 'that Heli was Joseph's father.' But this seeming contradiction vanishes, if we pay attention to the manner in which the Jews sometimes traced their genealogy. In Deuteronomy,* the law declares, 'that if one brother dies 'without children, the surviving brother shall marry his re-'lict, in order to raise up issue for the deceased,' which issue was to bear his name. Hence, a twofold genealogy amongst the Jews; the one legal, the other natural. Jacob and Heli were brothers. Heli died without issue. Jacob married his relict, and begot Joseph, the husband of Mary. Thus, when St. Luke calls Heli 'Joseph's father,' he means, his father, according to the law: and when St. Matthew calls Jacob 'Joseph's father,' he means, his father, according to nature: and by this means, the Evangelists are easily reconciled. Other solutions are given to this difficulty, and you are at your option to give the preference to which you choose. The Jewish records, and their family registers have been burnt with the archives of their temple. We live at too great a distance to settle the genealogies of their families. The Evangelists, besides the gift of inspiration, had every information, as they were nearer the times. In certain countries, there are some traces of this ancient custom of giving the denomination of father or uncle to a person who is not

* Chap. xxv.

either the one or the other, but by a fiction of law. Hence, in the province of Britany, in France, by their municipal law, a relation, in a remoter degree, inherits as an uncle; and has the title of 'Oncle a la mode de Bretagne,' an uncle, according to the custom of Britany.

If, of two historians, in writing the life of one of their nobles, one said, that he was nephew to one, and the other, that he was nephew to another, could we impeach either with ignorance, when both could be reconciled by examining into the customs of the country in which they wrote? And, if the rule stands good with regard to authors of credit and repute, how much more so, with regard to inspired writers?

Let us now examine your difficulty relative to this famous prophecy of Isaiah,* applied to Jesus Christ by St. Matthew,† 'a virgin shall conceive, and bring forth a Son: and they 'shall call his name Immanuel: that is to say, God is with 'us.'

You assert, that, 'St. Matthew did not well understand the 'Prophet's meaning:' and, 'that this prophecy concerns one 'Maher-shalal-hashbas, born of a prophetess, and given as a 'sign to Ahaz, king of Judah.' An easy way to elude a text of Scripture! Mistakes and ignorance attributed to inspired writers!

We are to state the fact that gave occasion to this prophecy, before we attempt to unfold its mysterious sense, and to shew how the coincidence of circumstances makes it applicable to Jesus Christ, and to him alone.

The kings of Israel and Syria laid siege to Jerusalem, with a design to cut off the house of David, and place a stranger on the throne. Ahaz, who could not be ignorant of Jacob's prophecy, who had foretold, 'that the sceptre should not depart from the house of Judah, until Shiloh, or the Messiah, 'was come'‡ apprehended, not only the reduction of the city, but moreover the total excision of the Jewish polity, which was to happen when the sceptre was to depart from the house of David: as it afterwards came to pass, about the time of the birth of Christ, when the Jews were obliged to receive such kings as the Romans chose to appoint.

To dispel the fears of the desponding king, the Prophet gives him two signs, confirming, first, that the sceptre should

*Chap. vii. verse 14. † Chap. i. ‡ Genesis, chap. xxix.

not depart from the house of David, until a child is born of a virgin, in a miraculous manner, who would be God himself, *Immanuel:* and, as there was not such a miraculous child in his kingdom, he might rest secure that the sceptre should not depart so soon from the royal line. Thus, his alarms, concerning the house of David, are quieted, in hearing the prophecy foretelling a miraculous birth, which was to happen at a distant period. There still remained another doubt, viz. whether the confederate kings would take Jerusalem, besieged by such powerful forces? And this the prophet removed, by telling him, that his own child* should not be of age to discern good from evil, before the two kings would be cut off.

Between Immanuel and Maher-shalal-hashbas there is not the least connexion. The first signifies, in Hebrew, *God with us:* the second signifies, *hasten to take the spoils: make haste to take the prey.*' The one is conceived by a virgin, the other is the fruit of connubial ties: and the Prophet expressly declares it.† Upon this occasion, we do not read, that he married a second wife: neither was polygamy familiar to austere persons of the prophetic profession: and the third verse, of the seventh chapter, absolutely precludes a state of virginity, whereas the Prophet is commanded to go with his son to meet the king: and this son must be older than Maher-shalal-hashbas.

The prophecy, then, relates to two different persons, Immanuel and Maher-shalal-hashbas; two different objects, the excision of the royal line of David, and the reduction of Jerusalem; two different events and signs; the raising of the siege, and the defeat of the two confederate kings, which was to be accomplished speedily, before the prophet's child could cry to his father and mother: and the other, I mean the total extinction of the Jewish regal authority, when the sceptre was to be wrested from David's descendants, and lodged in the hands of the Essenian kings, under the protection of the Romans, about the time of Immanuel's birth, 'who is God 'above all, and blessed for ever.'

Should any doubt still remain, concerning this famous prophecy, faith is the firm anchor that ought to fix the doubts of a fluctuating mind: and humility should be so far preva-

* Mentioned, chap. viii. ver. 4. † In chap. viii. ver. 3.

lent, as to induce us to prefer the opinion of an inspired writer before our own. We must renounce the Scriptures, or acknowledge that an Evangelist is a more competent judge of a prophet's meaning than we can pretend to be.

After wading through those difficulties, I shall not swell my page with all the passages quoted in your book, to prove Christ's humanity: I allow them all. But what are we to do with all the texts that prove his divinity? 'The Alpha and 'Omega.' 'The beginning and end.' 'My Father and I 'are one.' 'The first and the last.' 'A God manifested in 'flesh; a God mortified in flesh.' 'God was the Word.' Supreme worship due to God alone. 'Let all the angels of 'God adore him.' Eternal generation. 'This day I have 'begotten thee.' The express appellation of a God, and his sovereign dominion. 'Unto the Son he saith, thy throne, 'O God, is for ever and ever,' &c. &c. &c.

To elude the texts that assert his divinity, you take refuge in a vain distinction of two characters in which Christ appeared; the one private, the other public: a man, in his private character; an ambassador or messenger of God, in his public ministry, by shewing his credentials, and assuming the title of God, in quality of an ambassador. I appeal to the judgment of the public, if this be not sporting with words, and perverting the use of language.

In the most solemn negociations between monarchs, do their ambassadors or envoys arrogate to themselves the title of kings? And in the most authentic ratifications of treaties, do not they sign in their masters' names? Has any of them the presumption to pass for the son of his master? When Christ said to his disciples, 'as my living Father has sent me, 'so I send you.' When St. Paul said, 'we are Christ's am-'bassadors,' did either he or any of the Apostles say, 'I am 'Christ; Christ and I are one. Whatever Christ does, I do 'in like manner. I am before Abraham. I am before all 'things?'

When, by way of allusion, the title of God is given to any mortal in the Scriptures, the limitations and restrictions, under which it is given, evidently preclude an indisputable claim to such an awful title. It is a gift bestowed with a parsimonious hand. 'I have made thee the God of Pharaoh,' says the Almighty to Moses. This word, Pharaoh, limits

and circumscribes the power of the deified mortal, and evinces a precarious title. 'I have said ye are Gods,' but the addition of the following words, 'ye shall die,' clears up the prophet's meaning. Besides, this appellation is given by some others: no person assumes it himself. Christ declares, that he is the Son of God, the same with his Father. In his person, all the lineaments of the Divinity are united. Prophecies and oracles, predicting 'that God himself will come 'to save us,' are applied to him. He declares himself to be the same: and St. Paul affirms, that he thought it no usurpation to be equal to the Most High.

In vain, then, it is alleged, that Christ and his Apostles applied these oracles and passages to the Son of God, in a figurative manner, or, to use the term of the schools, *in an accommodate sense.*

Lucifer himself, who attempted 'to raise his throne above 'the clouds, and make himself like unto the Most High,' could not have used a more impious and blasphemous figure, than to usurp the name and attributes of the sovereign Being; to require the same homage, adoration, and love, that are due to the Divinity. 'He that loves father and mother 'more than me, is not worthy to be my disciple.' 'Whoever 'loves his soul more than me, is not worthy to be my dis-'ciple.' Did mortal before ever use such words?

All other figures and allegories are explained in some part of Scripture, or wrapped up in mysterious clouds, to be dispelled by the brightness of eternal day, after exercising our belief: but with regard to the Divinity of Christ, if it be a figure, it is a metaphor continued through a long chain of prophecies and oracles, without the least explication to unfold its mysterious sense, repeated almost in every page of the New Testament, and sealed with the blood of Christ, his Apostles, and Martyrs. When he appeared on earth to convert the Jews and Gentiles, and destroy idolatry, which blindfolded mankind, could he have taken more opposite steps to his mission, than to raise the dead, and change the course of nature, in proof of a doctrine insinuating his Divinity, if he had no real claim to the title? At a time when the credulous multitude were apt to enrol extraordinary men in the number of their Gods; when they worshipped the earth that nourished them; the air that refreshed them; the

sun that enlightened them; the moon that directed their steps in the obscurity of night; the fire that warmed them; the heroes that cleared the woods and forests of lions and serpents that annoyed them; the conquerors who delivered them from their enemies; the wise and generous princes who rendered their subjects happy, and the memory of their reign immortal. At a time when altars were erected at Athens, to the Unknown God; when the priests of Salamis raised the sacrifice knife, to offer victims in honour of Paul, whom they took for Mercury, on account of his eloquence, and the novelty of his doctrine; and in honour of Barnabas, whom they revered as Jupiter, on account of his venerable aspect: and when the sortileges of Simon, the magician, procured him the honour of a temple at Rome, and the appellation of the *great God*. At such a critical period, when gratitude deified benefactors, and extraordinary powers laid the foundations of temples, and swelled the catalogue of false Gods; it was a dangerous and ill-timed doctrine, to preach that he was equal to God; that he was the Son of God; that eternal life consisted in the knowledge of himself and of his Father; to command his followers to lay down their lives, sooner than deny him, &c. and to confirm this doctrine by silencing the winds that subsided at his nod; by calming the stormy seas; changing the nature of the elements; restoring sight to the blind; the use of their limbs to the lame; forcing Death to surrender his spoils; and all nature to acknowledge his power and empire. Shall a Paul and Barnabas tear their garments in being taken for something more than mortal men; and shall Jesus Christ, if he be not God, in a calm, deliberate manner, rob the Creator of all things, of his glory and the worship due to him, in affirming that himself and the God of heaven are *one*; in applauding the faith of the apostle who said that he was *the Son of the living God*: and in not checking the disciple who, after thrusting his hand into his side, exclaimed, 'my Lord, and my God!'

It is not only in the time of his liberty, when he visits the cities of Israel, healing their sick, raising their dead, feeding multitudes with a few loaves, and refusing the temporal sovereignty which the people offered him, that he attributes to himself the prerogatives of the divinity. It is in chains, in the the course of his trial, and on the cross: conjured by the high

priest to tell whether he is Christ the son of God, he answers in the affirmative; and, in proof of his assertion, says that they shall see him on the right hand of God. 'Do you hear 'the blasphemy?' cries out the other. Had he used any mental reservations on this occasion, by saying one thing and meaning another; by expressing outwardly, 'I am the son 'of God,' and restraining in his mind the sense of the words, to the quality of a messenger; he would not have answered according to the Pontiff's meaning, who knew but too well the difference between a messenger, such as any prophet may be, and a son, who must be of the same nature with his father. What a precedent for perjurers! And what blasphemy in St. Paul, who affirms, 'that he thought it no usurpation to make 'himself equal to God!'

Common sense often supplies the room of metaphysical demonstrations. And common sense will inform you, that Jesus Christ is either the greatest impostor that ever appeared, or that he is literally what he declared himself to be, *God and Man*, for whom the martyrs suffered, whom the Christians adore, and to whom all knees are to bend one day.

If he is an impostor, in vain has the blood of impure victims been drained; in vain have the altars of false deities been overturned; in vain have their idols been crushed, and their temples destroyed; a new idol has been set up in their room, and the worship due to the sovereign Being has been transferred to an impostor. If this be the case, God, then, must have deceived mortals, in investing an impostor, during his life, and his disciples, after his death, with such extraordinary powers. And the miracles wrought in confirmation of their doctrine, and which could never be wrought but by his express and immediate power, must have been wrought with an express design to mislead his creatures into delusion and error. Reconcile this, if you can, to his goodness, wisdom, and providence; and behold the absurdities to which incredulity leads.

If you intend to reconcile those texts, that attribute to the same person, an eternal generation and birth in time; transcendant glory and profound humility; the power and majesty of a God, with the sufferings and death of a man: admit in the same person the divine and human nature. Then, all seeming contradiction vanish. His infirmities and sufferings

are applicable to him, as Man; whilst his glorious characters and titles are to be attributed to his Godhead, disguised under a human veil. Thus, in Jesus Christ we find the God that created us, whereas he is the same with his father: the redeemer who purchased us, by paying our ransom: the spotless Pontiff, through whom we find access to the throne of mercy. His cross is folly to the Jew, and a scandal to the Gentile: but to the Christian it is the power and wisdom of God. For if he was not man, he could not suffer; and if he were not God, his sufferings would not avail us. He becomes man, to suffer for our sake: and, as God he gives his sufferings an infinite price.

I remain, &c.

ARTHUR O'LEARY.

LETTER IV.

SIR,

IN the preceding letters, we have touched upon the weakness of reason, and the necessity of revealed religion; the obscurity in which mortals were involved, and the incongruity of denying religious mysteries, when the book of nature, open to our eyes, is scarce legible; our fall in Adam, and our restoration in Christ.

It is now time to examine your opinion concerning the soul of man: an opinion which you deliver in the seventy-second page of your work, in these words: 'Hence, I conclude that the soul dies with the body. It is an opinion 'conformable to reason, observation, and to the doctrine 'taught by Jesus Christ and his apostles.' Whatever arguments you might have drawn from observation, you should have passed over the authority of Christ and his apostles; an authority never adduced before in support of a doctrine which in every page they condemn. Or, at least, you should have first a bible of your own, and forced it on the world, as handed to you by the angel Gabriel.

Man must certainly be liable to error, when, in the blaze of revelation, and after the progress philosophy has made in the world, he still cries out, with the disciple Epicurus:

'We know not yet how our soul's produc'd,
'Whether by body born, or else infus'd:
'Whether in death, breath'd out into the air,
'She doth confus'dly mix and perish there,
'Or through vast shades and horrid silence go,
'To visit brimstone caves and pools below.'*

Your observation must be quite different from the observations of the greatest men the faculty of physic ever produced: men who were, and are still, as great ornaments to the literary world, as they are useful to mankind.

We observe, sir, within ourselves, a principle that is obeyed as a sovereign; that now finds fault with what it before approved; that covets with passion what it despises after

* Creech's Lucretius, Book 1.

enjoying; and now rejoices and then mourns; that reasons and judges. I consult my reason; and it informs me, that this principle, so noble, and, at the same time, so liable to such conflicting agitations, cannot be a particle of matter, round or square, red or blue; a volatized vapour dissolvable into air; a contexture of atoms interwoven or separated by a sportive brain.

My reason informs me, that a being, capable to take in hands the government of a vast empire; to form projects, the success whereof depends on an infinity of different springs, whose motions and accords must be studied and combined, is something more than a little subtilized mud.

I observe matter with all its mutations and refinements; and I perceive nothing but extension, divisibility, figure, and motion.

My reason tells me, that the combinations of the different particles of matter, let their velocity be ever so great, can never reveal the sacred mysteries of faith; the holy rules of equity; the ideas of piety, order, and justice.

Moreover, reason informs us, that matter is indifferent to motion or rest, to this or that situation. When moved in any direction, the smallest particle of any body or mass of matter, must yield to the motion of the whole. On the other hand, in our temptations and struggles, amidst the solicitations of sense, and the cravings of appetite, we can say with St. Paul, that we feel an interior conflict and two opposite laws in ourselves: 'the law of the body warring against the 'law of the mind, and attempting to captivate us to the law 'of sin.' Under the inconvenience of such struggles and conflicts, a part of ourselves still remains the directing principle, always asserting its rights, and constantly supporting its native title to dominion.

Reconcile, if you can, to the laws of mechanism, to the cohesion of atoms, and to the motions of particles of matter, the infinite capacity of the soul, its strong desires after immortality, its power to infer conclusions from principles, in mathematical demonstrations, and logical arguments; its arbitrary and voluntary determinations, this shifting and changing, those strange and sudden returns, reflections, and transitions in thought, which, by experience, we find it in our power to make.

We all agree, that matter touches in contact, and that whatever moves, is put in motion by another. We know, on the other hand, that, in reasoning, argumentations, demonstrations, &c. wherein we infer one thing from another, and another thing from that inference, and a third from thence, and so on, there is an infinity of different modes of thought. If those different modes of thought be no more than the different states of the solid, figured, divisible parts of matter, with respect to velocity and direction, it is necessary that they should have been put into these different states, by the impulse of some foreign power.

If this mover, which is the cause of motion, be matter, it must be moved or acted on itself: for otherwise it could not produce a change of motion in other contiguous parts of matter. There must still be a mover prior to the former, and another prior to that, and so on to infinity, in every act of reason and argumentation. But a progression to infinity is discarded by all philosophers, both ancient and modern.

To spin out the subject in metaphysical arguments, were loss of time. Suffice it to say, that we would contradict our reason, and belie our hearts, in supposing that the troubles, agitations, and importunate remorses we feel after the commission of some horrid crime, the secret reproaches of a guilty conscience, which made the Athenian parricide cry out, twenty years after having murdered his father, that the crows upbraided him with his death: we would, I say, only belie our hearts, in supposing such interior punishments, which tread in the heels of guilt, to be no more than an assemblage of little atoms, with hooked or rough surfaces. In supposing that patience and resignation in our afflictions, from an expectation of immortality and the spiritual joys of future bliss, the distant reward of our trials, are the result of smooth atoms gliding through the brain; or that the horrors, which haunt the guilty, proceed from the same cause which produces a pain in the head, back, or stomach.

Further, under the dispensation of a just and powerful God, crimes must be punished, and virtue rewarded. What notion can we form of a God, who makes no distinction between the wretch who strangles his father, in order to take possession of his estate, and the just man who is disposed to

of all things has ordained their acting in concert, during our short pilgrimage here on earth.

Ignorance in children, and stupidity in old people, arise from the insertion of an active and spiritual substance in matter not fitly disposed, and yet ordained to be its organ and instrument. The brain is too moist in children, and too dry in old people; consequently, unapt either for the reception or retention of the images transmitted from exterior objects; which images or representations are the materials for the soul to work on. The pencil cannot delineate well, if the canvas be unfit. Letters cannot be formed with nice and delicate strokes, if the pen be bad. It is neither the painter's nor writer's fault, if their skill does not shine in their respective performances, the defect originates in the unaptness of the materials: it is the same case with the soul. This spiritual and immortal substance, seated in the head, as a pilot at the helm, who, besides his innate skill, wants the assistance of the sails and rudder, to steer the unwieldy vessel, or as a monarch in his palace, who has none but sickly and disordered subjects to command, the soul, I say, stands in need of the organs of the body, as so many ministers of sensation, towards the exertions of its faculties.

If I am confined to a chamber that has but one window, I cannot see through more than one. If there be more, I can see through all. The visual faculty, in both cases, is the same; and the difference consists in the removal of the obstacles. Thus, on the loss of an eye or limb, the soul is neither blind or lame; it is still the same, though its instrumentality be partly destroyed. But if the brain, whose inexplicable folds and spacious palaces are the repositories of the various images coming in through their respective avenues from exterior objects, be disordered and obstructed by drunkenness, apoplexy, &c. the passages become impracticable; the canvas becomes wrinkled and uneven, the glowing colours cannot spread, the size and attitude of the figures are confounded, and all the requisites of reasoning are wanting. Let the drunken man sleep, and the sick man recover, then the obstacles are removed, and reason will inform you, that the soul is still the same.

If the soul, then, under the inconveniences of the foregoing

circumstances of drunkenness, fever, &c. still retains a faculty or power of perceiving, reasoning, and judging, to be exerted when these obstacles are removed; how much more capable will it not be of those spiritual functions, after its separation from the mass of clay, when disentangled from its fetters, with its enlargement from the body, 'it will return to the God who 'gave it!'

But you inform us, that 'God can do any thing that does 'not imply a contradiction:' and that, 'by an infinite power, 'he can add thought to matter.'

But, Sir, must not a man be very sanguine in the cause of scepticism, and eager to work himself into incredulity, when he has recourse to infinite power, sooner than admit a spiritual soul? If God can add thought to matter, why deny, in a peremptory manner, the possibility of uniting spirit to body? Locke acknowledges the possibility of adding thought to matter, to the great comfort of our modern free-thinkers; but still he acknowledges his soul to be spiritual and immortal.

No unhappy comfort can then arise to those whose greatest joy would consist in being a lump of animated earth, from Locke's opinion: for God can do several things which he will never perform. He never will animate a stone, or tree; and cover them with flesh, susceptible of passions, and willing to gratify them; give them the organs of speech, and thus introduce on the stage of life, a set of dogmatizing philosophers, who will glory in being the brothers of plants and mushrooms: as Bisas, the philosopher, said of the Athenians, who gloried in being originally sprung from the earth.

Sound logic does not allow to argue from possibility to fact; and, though every respect is due to Locke's authority, yet his possibility of *thinking matter*, and others of his hypotheses, are objected to, by the learned. Nor has he any room to complain, if the world does not pay him the same implicit obedience which the disciples of Pythagoras paid their master, for several great mathematicians and metaphysicians consider, as very possible, systems which Locke rejects, as contradictions.

We cannot account for the operations of the soul, upon the principles of mechanism. We know that the motions of

parts, and the artful manner of combining them, can produce nothing but an artful structure, and various modes of motion. Hence, all machines, however artfully their parts are put together, and however complicated their structure, though we conceive innumerable different motions variously combined, and running into one another, with an endless variety, yet never produce any thing but figure and motion. Much less can we account for our mental operations, from the properties of matter. Lucretius and his followers may employ their plastic powers in forming a soul composed of particles of air, fire, vapour, and a fourth *something* which that poet does not describe.

They will acknowledge, that none of those elementary particles, separate from the rest, can think; but that, from their mixture and collision, thought results; which they attempt to prove by the example of the tree and the earth, neither of which produces fruit in a separate state. But it is obvious, that the tree contains in itself the seed of the fruit, which the earth stirs and developes; and, to give justness to the comparison, by the same rule, either the fire or air should contain in itself the origin of thought, which is an absurdity.

If you admit, that God can superadd thought to matter, this thought, then, must be a quality superior to matter, and, consequently, distinct from it. Then the contradiction is palpable, for it will follow, that it is matter and not matter at the same time.

As to the brutes, become of late the subjects of philosophical panegyric, that raises them to an equality with man, we like them for the service or diversion they afford us; but, *less virtuous than our philosophers*, we have not humility to wish to be on a level with them. Pity our pride and ignorance, great oracles, who revile the Christians and extol the cunning of the fox, the imitative powers of the ape, the architecture of the beaver, and the provident foresight of the ant.

Since you believe them of the same nature with yourselves, why do you not arraign the cruelty of the magistrates, under whose eyes so many murders are daily committed on your brethren? For if man and the brute be of

the same nature, why should beasts be killed with impunity, whilst the assassin is doomed to the gibbet? The question may seem childish; yet your refined philosophy is humbly requested to give a solid answer. Your Catechism can illustrate the subject.

THE

FREE-THINKER'S CATECHISM:

Faithfully collected from some of the most celebrated Free-thinkers of this Age.

Question. Who made man?

Answer. Nothing.

Q. How did he come into the world?

A. He sprung out of the earth, spontaneously, as a mushroom.*

Q. The souls of men and brutes, are they of the same nature?

A. Yes.†

Q. What difference, then, is there between man and the brute?

A. Man is a more multiplied animal, with hands and flexible fingers. The paws and feet of other animals are covered, at the extremities, with a horny substance; or terminate in claws or talons.‡

Q. Our superiority over the brute creation, in arts, sciences, modesty, civilization, is, then, owing to our hands and fingers, not to any innate principle of reason?

A. Doubtless.

Q. But the apes, whose paws are much like ours, why have not they made the same progress?

* Voltaire on the population of America.
† Servetus of Cork.
‡ Helvetius, livre de l'Esprit, p. 233.

A. Apes live on fruits: and being, like children, in perpetual motion, they are not susceptible of that *ennui*, or of wearisomeness, to which we are liable.*

Q. Is there any virtue in worshipping God, in loving our father, in serving our country, or in relieving the distressed?

A. No.

Q. In what light, then, are we to consider virtue?

A. Cry out with Brutus: '*O vertu tu ne'es qu'un vain nom!*' 'O virtue, thou art but an empty sound!'†

Lo, the refined system introduced by those great oracles of human wisdom. If the cannibals, who eat their aged parents, ever learn to read, they will find their justification in your Catechism.

Our philosophers are the great panegyrists of the instinct of animals, whilst they degrade the reason of man. The cause is obvious; in pointing out the brutes as rivals qualified to contend for superiority with us, they can argue with ease and satisfaction. 'All dies with the brutes: all dies 'with man. Let us then live as they do; for our end will 'be the same.' But still this way of reasoning, how flattering soever to sensuality, cannot remove the perplexing doubt; for if the brute's soul be of the same nature with that of man, then there is no certainty that the soul of the brute dies. For, laying aside religion, which has decided the question, 'fear not those who can kill the body, but are 'not able to kill the soul,' there is no demonstration that the soul of man dies, but every thing demonstrates the reverse. To argue, then, with any colour of reason, from the brute to the man, you must have a thorough conviction of two things: first, that the soul of the brute is of the same nature with the soul of man; secondly, that the soul of man dies. Neither can be demonstrated, and consequently the assistance which our *two-footed* philosophers expect from this league and confederacy, into which they would fain enter with apes and *four-footed* animals, for the destruction of our souls, is no more than a broken reed.

* Helvetius, livre de l'Esprit, p. 3. † Ibid. p. 397.

But you will ask me, 'in what this instinct of the brutes, 'and the nature of their souls consists?' I answer, candidly, that I know not. Some philosophers are of opinion, that the brutes are mere machines, moved by some exterior agent. Others allow them an inherent principle of life and industry. To the opinion of the latter I accede; and believe, that what we call *instinct*, is a certain sagacity and inclination given them by the Creator for their preservation and our use.—But you, who know the nature of your own soul, which you affirm to be of the same nature with that of apes and foxes, can resolve the question.

Buffon, the French academician, acknowledges, that, in the anatomy or dissection of apes, he could not discover any difference between their organs and those of the human species; yet the same Buffon, in spite of the similiarity of organs, admits, that the distance between man and the ape is infinite, on account of thought, reason, and consciousness, which proceed from a spiritual principle: and the Royal Psalmist recommends to us, not to 'resemble the horse and 'the mule, that have no understanding.' Our ignorance of the nature of their instinct, souls, &c. does not imply an ignorance of the nature of our own. If, through the veil of a mortal body, we can know and love our Maker, why should we cease to know him, when the mask falls, and the veil is removed? If we admit no annihilation in nature, and that matter, in spite of its changes, never perishes, why should we refuse the soul the same privilege? If brutes could reason, judge, abstract, divide, compare the rules of order, justice, good and evil, as rational beings do, they would not answer the end of nature; and what has been made for the use of man, would become his destruction.

By dint of blows and other means, we can train up a horse to point out the hour on a dial; a bear to dance; a monkey to supply the place of a postillion; and a dog to move a minute. Several instances of the sagacity of animals are adduced by Plutarch and others. But, whatever variety of turns and motions they may acquire by such a culture, it is not to a principle of reason, but to the address of their tutors, we are to attribute it: for, however quick their hearing, how sagaci-

ous soever their instinct, it would be vain to attempt instructing them in the beauty of order, the rules of justice, the rights of society, the origin of the world, the love of their Maker, the terrors of the last judgment, the pains of hell, or the ineffable joys of a future state. Whoever doubts me, let him try the experiment.

It is not so with the savage or child. They are capable of instruction in all those points, and susceptible of the impressions arising from the notions of moral good or moral evil.

Hence, neither from the sagacity of brutes, nor the experience of mankind, nor the *observations of philosophers* can arguments be adduced in support of a doctrine tending to overthrow the spirituality and immortality of the soul. And, when you attribute the doctrine of the soul's immortality to the subtilty of schoolmen, and when Helvetius fixes its first introduction in Nero's time, when the Gospel was preached at Rome,* we cannot arraign either you or him for ignorance, as both are well read; but we charge you with wilful imposition, which is worse.

Scattered sparks of the soul's immortality are to be found in the Old Testament. Resurrection, judgment, the rewards and punishments of a future life, are mentioned by the inspired writers, long before the introduction of the Gospel, or Hesiod's theogony. Pythagoras taught the metempsychosis, or transmigration of souls, long before Seneca taught Nero to declaim. Even ancient errors shew how ancient was the belief of the soul's immortality; and demonstrate, that it is to be ranked amongst the first traditions of mankind. Did not almost all men sacrifice to the *manes*, that is, to the souls of the dead? From one extremity of the world to the other, people of different humours, countries, worship and interest, agree in this important article of immortality. It is no collusion; for a general association of mankind could never be formed: nor a prejudice of education, for manners, customs, and education, are different in different nations. This notion of immortality is common to all: remote isles, and foreign nations figured to themselves shades and climes, through which the roving spirit was to travel, after its separation from the body. Hence the custom of killing wives and of-

* Helvetius, livre de l'Esprit.

ficers, at the death of their kings; lest the royal ghost should travel without attendants. This several nations practised, and the Indians, distinguished by pagan authors, amongst the assertors of the immortality of the soul, were also the first that introduced those horrid murders upon earth, which they practise to this very day. Nature, then, taught the soul's immortality, without a monitor; or rather, the Almighty has stamped its notion on our existence; and savage people, in forgetting God, could not forget themselves.

There are still some religious, as well as philosophical paradoxes in your writings, besides the capital errors already mentioned, I have not leisure to examine them all.

You say, that, 'from the continual waste of mould, 'washed away by the rain, the animal world will become ex-'tinct, for want of food.' This, I suppose, is advanced with a design to invalidate the oracles which foretel the world's dissolution by fire. A prodigious quantity of the liquid element is wasted in watering fields, woods, &c. Doctor Halley is of opinion, that the Mediterranean loses in vapour, five thousand, five hundred, and eighty millions of tons, in a day; and receives but one thousand, eight hundred, and twenty-seven, from rivers: so that it would soon be drained, unless a great quantity returned in dew and rain upon it.

It seems, then, to me, that *the animal world will be extinct for want of drink:* but a greater prophet than either of us, foretold the world's dissolution by fervent heat.

You argue against the *Chinese antiquities, from the waste of mould:* by the same rule, you can argue against Moses' account of the creation. But, to argue against the antiquities of any nation, from the waste of mould, is nothing better than the waste of time. The European missionaries convinced the Chinese of their error, by reckoning the eclipses of the sun, in a conference with their learned men, when the emperor of Tartary became master of China. It was the surest method, and that by which Callisthenes baffled the pretended antiquity of the Babylonians, when Alexander took their city.

If Moses be an allegorical writer, it is hard, 'from the

'waste of mould,' to determine when the Alps emerged from the chaos.

You are of opinion, that, before the deluge, 'none but 'giants inhabited the earth.' Before the deluge the world had its *Davids* and *Goliahs*, its *Fionnmacools* and *Ushions*.—Moses talks of giants, as rarities: 'in them days, there 'were giants on the earth.' A rarity is an exception to the general rule, and supposes a more extensive class of beings.

The longevity of the antediluvians can be ascribed to two causes: the one supernatural, in order to perpetuate religion, and give the aged patriarchs time to instil it into the minds of their spreading generations: the other natural, viz. their sobriety, the simplicity of their diet, the salubrity of the air, not corrupted by the noxious vapours which rose from the earth, after the flood, the fertility of the soil, &c. You know the state of the world, before the deluge so well, that you fix 'the age of puberty at the age of sixty-five.' I believe that procreation began, before the deluge, as early as at present. Or else, they must have been monstrous babes that were at the breast, and fed with spoon-meat, at the age of twenty. By the rules of analogy, we may judge of their nubile state, by the tall Prussian, and low Laplander. The size is disproportionate: but the age for marrying is the same in both.

You deny any confusion of tongues at the dispersion; because what has been translated *language*, signifies *lip*, in Hebrew. Sometimes it does, but the addition of *speech* signifies something more. 'And the whole earth was of one 'language, and of one speech.'* And what is here translated *speech*, signifies *words*, in the original Hebrew.

You deny that there were *any propitiatory sacrifices*. There are sin-offerings, notwithstanding, mentioned in the Scriptures, 'for the bodies of those beasts, whose blood for 'sin is brought into the sanctuary, by the high priest, are 'burnt without the camp. In proof of your opinion, you 'mention, Pythagoras's hecatomb for being able to prove 'the properties of a right-angled triangle; Jephtah's offer-'ing up his daughter: Baal's priests cutting themselves 'with knives,' to propitiate their god; and, to crown all,

* Genesis, chap. ii.

you assert, that the God of Israel changed sides, when the king of Moab sacrificed his son on the walls of his city.*

But, Sir, were not sacrifices instituted by the Almighty God? Why should his holy rites and ceremonies be set on a level with heathen profanations, Baal's priests, and Pythagoras's idols? A sacrifice is the oblation of a sensible thing, by a lawful minister, in honour of the divinity, in acknowledgment of his supreme power over life and death. Not only human victims were interdicted by the law, but even several animals; such as asses, hares, &c. Hence, Jephtah's sacrifice, if he killed his daughter, was a cruel murder; he was no fit priest; his daughter was no fit victim; and God cannot be honoured by a breach of his own law.

I say, 'if he killed his daughter,' because, in the original Hebrew, it may as well signify, 'devoted to the Lord?' meaning that he devoted her to perpetual chastity: as several modern critics explain it, and as it seems to be the case. For, inspired as he was, it is not to be presumed that he was guilty of such a fatal mistake: and St. Paul reckons him amongst the worthies who, by faith, obtained the promised reward.

How, then, could the God of Israel 'change sides,' by relishing the profane vapours of idolatrous blood, smoaking, not in his honour, but in honour of the idols of the Moabites? The text you quote, 'and there was great indignation 'against Israel,' proves no more, than that the confederate kings were angry with themselves for having forced the unhappy father to plunge, as it were, the dagger in his own bowels, in the person of his son.

When, to deny propitiatory sacrifices, you say, that 'God cannot be bribed or flattered,' I agree with you: but, you would not controul his power, nor contest his authority, to impose laws and obligations on his creatures; to annex to the observance and infraction of those laws, rewards and punishments; to require their submission by visible symbols; in the victim stretched and bound on the altar, to remind them of the chains of sin, and of their state under their Creator's hand, who, each instant, can deprive them of their lives; in the sable smoak rolling from the blazing holocaust,

* 2 Kings, chap. iii.

to make them perceive a ray of hope, directing their eyes to a distant victim, the effusion of whose blood was to quench, one day, more active flames, and to change this scene of carnage and misery, into means of expiation; not indeed by the virtue and efficacy of the sacrifices in themselves, but inasmuch as they typified the immolation of 'the Lamb that 'is slain from the foundations of the world,' in the observance of whose law, and in the love and knowledge of whose person, consists eternal life. Age, a variety of accidents, and the uncertainty of death, press our return to a merciful Redeemer. It is too late to dispute with Jesus Christ his divinity, or with the soul its immortality, when the spirit is arraigned at the awful tribunal of the Judge of the living and the dead.

I have the honour to be,

Your affectionate servant,

ARTHUR O'LEARY.

LOYALTY ASSERTED,

OR THE

NEW TEST OATH VINDICATED,

And proved by the Principles of the Canon and Civil Laws, and the Authority of the most eminent Writers... With an Enquiry into the Pope's deposing Power, and the groundless Claims of the Stuarts, &c. &c. &c.

IN A LETTER TO A PROTESTANT GENTLEMAN.

'Duo sunt, Imperator Auguste, auctoritas sacra
'Pontificum, et regalis potestas.'
Gelasius, in epist. ad Anastasium.

Sir,

Notwithstanding newspaper declamations, and the very heavy charges brought against popery, you are candid enough to tell me, that 'you do not look on my profession 'as an imputation so dangerous that it entirely destroys all 'correspondence.' You are not mistaken in your conjectures. However we may differ in belief, you have nothing to apprehend; as speculative tenets do not interfere with the duties of civil life, and that my practical doctrine tends more to improve, than corrupt the heart.

We have been school-fellows, and well united. We have met in foreign kingdoms, and the remembrance of an early acquaintance has cemented our friendship anew. We are restored once more to our native isle, floating in an ocean of politics, and exhibiting as great a variety of religions, opinions, and sentiments, as you have seen curiosities at the fair of St. Ovid's in Paris.

What party shall we side? What plan shall we pursue? If we treat as enemies all those whose persuasion is different from ours, the number of our friends will be but small. Let us then be retainers to Dean Swift's doctrine. Let the Christians agree in the points allowed on all sides, as much as they differ with regard to private opinions, and dissentions shall be soon at an end. They all agree, that the first of their laws, is a law of eternal love, expanding into sentiments of benevolence, and teaching its votaries to return affection for hatred, and good for evil: that it is a divine legacy bequeathed by their common Redeemer to his followers; and that Christians, cemented together by the blood of a God, should never be divided.

This is a point of doctrine liable to no controversy. Oh! could it be enforced on the mind, factions would soon expire, and charity ascend the throne, holding broils, dissentions, slanders, calumnies at her feet, as so many captives in chains.

'Toleration in a Popish priest!' If by toleration is meant indifference as to religion, God forbid! In this sense it implies an error; and though it makes a great figure in the disputes among divines, yet in two words we can ascertain its degrees and measures. *Let us never tolerate error in ourselves: let us pity it in our neighbours.* 'Detest the error,' says St. Augustine, 'but love the 'man.' For in the conflict of different opinions that will divide the world to the end of time, Christian charity still asserts her prerogatives. Her oily balsam heals the ranking ulcer caused by a *religious inflammation*, and attenuates the black and viscous humours, which so often degenerate into an *evangelical spleen.*

But, if by toleration we mean impunity, safety, and protection granted by the state, to every sect that does not maintain doctrines inconsistent with the public peace, the rights of sovereigns, and the safety of our neighbour, to such a toleration I give my patronacy; and expect that the following proofs of the articles of the test, will evince the justness of entitling the Roman Catholics to the lenity of government, and the confidence of their fellow-subjects.

THE

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE.

ART. I.

'I, A. B. do take Almighty God to witness, that I will be 'faithful and bear true allegiance to our most gracious So- 'vereign Lord, King George the Third, and him will de- 'fend to the utmost of my power, against all conspiracies 'and attempts whatever, that shall be made against his 'person, crown and dignity.'

Although I should never swear any allegiance in form, yet there is an original and natural allegiance from subject to king; a debt that forbids all conspiracies and treasonable practices 'against his person, crown, and dignity.' At my birth I was under his protection; and in a tender infancy, when I could not protect myself, I was shielded by his name. His tribunals are still open to secure my life and liberty; and as there is an implied contract between king and subject, my oath does not change the nature of my obligations. It only strengthens the civil band by the tie of religion, and superadds to treason the guilt of perjury in the transgressors. This obligation is corroborated by the positive injunctions of the Scripture, enforcing obedience to the prince whose image is stamped on his coin, and grounded on the laws of the nation, which, from the earliest periods, have transferred the subject's allegiance to the king, for the time being, and declared it high treason in a subject to attempt any thing even against an usurper, while he is in full possession of the sovereignty. This the laws have wisely ordained, in order to prevent anarchy and confusion; because the common people cannot judge of the king's title. But here I thrust my sickle into the civilian's field; though in the end, oaths of allegiance should be determined by the laws and maxims of the realm, as well as by principles of divinity.* Further, let

* Vide Blackstone's Commentaries, book I. chap. 10. Cooke, 3 Inst. 7. Kel. rep. 15.

it be remarked, that the foundation of this decision has been laid in Catholic times; and that in applying it to the actual circumstances, I do not mean to distinguish between right and fact in our most gracious Sovereign. I only argue *a minori ad majus*, to shew the guilt of attempting any thing against a lawful Sovereign, whereas it is high treason to conspire against an usurper.

The famous distinction between '*rex de jure*,' and '*rex de facto*,' how interesting soever in the times of the contending families of York and Lancaster, James II. and William III. is now of as much importance as this great question, so warmly debated among our grave moralists: 'Who is happier, a king awake, or a cobler asleep, who dreams that he is a king?' I do not choose to disturb the rest of *sleeping monarchs*, and whoever has a relish for *dreams*, has my consent, though I like more solid food.

ART. II.

'AND I do faithfully promise to maintain, support, and defend, to the utmost of my power, the succession of the throne, in his Majesty's family, against any person or persons whatsoever.'

Any thing that does not clash with the laws of God, whatever is conducive to the public good, and has for its immediate object, the peace of society, and avoidance of bloodshed, civil wars, and public calamities, can be safely sworn to, and the object of a lawful oath; but such is the nature of the second article of the test, which, according to the wise laws of a nation wherein the crown is hereditary in the wearer, equally guards against revolutions so frequent in despotic states, and elective kingdoms. In the first, the prince names his successor; and, as others may think themselves injured by such a partial preference, the throne is as tottering as the succession is arbitrary. Witness the history of the oriental nations.

In elective kingdoms, corruption, violence, and bribery precede the coronation: bloodshed and misery are the consequences. Poland is no more, because there have been many candidates, but no heir to the throne. Her *liberum*

veto, or charter of unbounded liberty to oppose the king, has aided Prussia and Austria in riveting her chains. Here we know our king from his cradle. The object of our homage depends not on the caprice of a father, nor on the ambition of the nobles. It is determined by the law. As our king never dies, we are exposed to no revolutions by the choice of a successor. 'The order of succession is, in monarchies, founded on the welfare of the state: it is not 'fixed for the reigning family; but because it is the interest 'of the state, that it should have a reigning family.'*

ART. III.

'HEREBY utterly abjuring any allegiance or obedience 'unto the person taking upon himself the style and title 'of Prince of Wales in the life-time of his father, and 'who, since his death, is said to have assumed the style 'and title of King of Great Britain and Ireland, by the 'name of Charles the Third, and to any other person 'claiming or pretending a right to the crown of these 'realms.'

The proofs of this article may be seen in the explanation of the first. 'It is impossible to serve two masters.' Allegiance is due to the reigning sovereign, and from the earliest times, to him alone. In whose name is justice administered? 'In the name of George the Third.' In whose name are we protected from the midnight robber? 'In the name of 'George the Third,' &c. &c.

Now, Sir, I must entreat your patience. You know, that in all parliamentary debates on the oppressive operation of the penal laws, the Stuarts are the greatest obstacle in the Catholic way to a legal indulgence. They are considered by some of the illustrious members, as the polar star by which we expect to steer one day into a haven of safety and deliverance; whilst we ourselves look on them as planets of a malific influence.

"Aut Sirius ardor,
"Ille sitim morbosque ferens mortalibus ægris,
"Nascitur, et lævo contristat lumine cœlum."
VIRGIL.

* Montesquieu, Esprit des Loix, vol. II. p. 192.

To state the case, and disabuse gentlemen, amiable and humane, in all other respects, but, unluckily for our interest, too suspicious of a foreign attachment, which we absolutely disclaim, let us view the Stuarts in three respects: first, with regard to the obligations they have conferred on us: second, with regard to what we expect from them: third, with regard to their claims to the crown of England, in quality of descendants of its ancient and rightful kings. If there be no incentive to gratitude on our part, no right to our allegiance on theirs, the bonds of attachment are dissolved, and the great panegyrists of our love for the Stuart line, reduced to the alternative of adopting the unreasonable whim of the poet:

'Amo te, Zabede, sed nescio dicere quare.'
'I love you, Charles, but I know not why.'

or persuading themselves, that love is kindled by the flames of tyranny and oppression. The first is absurd, the second unnatural.

First, as to our obligations to this inauspicious family: history can inform you, that James the First signalized his generosity in our favour, by giving, under the finesse of laws, six counties in Ulster to Scotch planters. Hume attempts to justify his countrymen by the following shift: 'he gave them arts and manufactures in exchange.' The cruel Ahab was more generous; he offered real money for Naboth's vineyard. Grateful souls! bless your benefactor; he improved your minds at the expence of your bodies; and, like your preachers in Lent, *famished your flesh to fatten your spirit.*

Charles the First ran the same course with his father. No end of seizures, inquisitions, and regal plunder. Shamed at last into desistance by the Irish parliament, an artful stratagem is devised, equally calculated to answer the ends of rapacity, and exculpate the monarch. You have read in Suetonius, how Tiberius eluded the law that prohibited virgins to be put to death. A young lady is arraigned and condemned: the emperor permits the hangman to violate her, and throws the blame on her executioner. Remove the scene of action from Rome to Ireland, and in a dissimilar plot, the characters are much the same. The Earl of Strafford is named vicegerent, and takes the blame upon himself:

the king thanks him for his seasonable advice; and Ireland sees Tiberius and Sejanus revived in the persons of Charles and his favourite. In these two reigns, pursuits were not extended to goods and chattels alone. The sword of tyranny reached to conscience itself. Spiritual supremacy and religious uniformity, were inforced with such rigour, that according to Borlase, some of the clergy *used to hang themselves.* A sarcastic remark! the falsity whereof, was more owing to their constancy, than to the lenity of the Stuarts. Charles the Second, who, according to Lord Lyttleton, could have become as despotic a prince as any in Europe, sets up a sham court of claims, to save the appearance of justice. He confirms Cromwel's grants to the adventurers, who followed the banners of this regicide, tinctured with the blood of the royal martyr, obliges his enemies by the sacrifice of his defenders, consents to the special exception of Irish Catholics from the general act of indemnity, refuses the least assistance to Lord Rochfort, who sold his estate to support him during his exile, and give his sanction to a ridiculous law, declaring it high treason to call the king a Papist. Of all the transgressors of this law, he himself was the most signal, whereas he was confessed and anointed by a Benedictine monk: *and the magistrates must have been very remiss that did not hang him for contravening such an important decree, prohibiting to suspect for religion, a king who practised none.*

'Nec lex æquior ulla est,
'Quam necis artifices arte perire sua.'
OVID.

However, the Irish Catholics can never sufficiently thank him, for not punishing with halter, gibbet, and exenteration, a *requiescat in pace.*

To this long train of Stuart hostilities, James the Second is the only exception. As Dissenters and Roman Catholics were equally disqualified, he removed all penal restraints.—Religion influenced him, doubtless. But did not his favours and indulgence extend to Scotch dissenters, as well as to Irish Catholics? Did not the good of the state, strengthened by the affections and power of its subjects, ever and always weakened by their tepidity and indigence, require then, as it does now, a relaxation of oppressive laws? And was it

not the king's interest, to endeavour to render all his subjects prosperous and happy? Did he but proceed on a legal plan with the consent of his parliament, without arrogating to himself a dispensing power, which the nation vests in the aggregate body of king, lords, and commons? But can the conduct of James the Second stand the test? Or must not an Irishman be blind in not perceiving the partiality of this cherished twig of the Stuart stem?

Ambition, or love for their fellow subjects, induces kings to exchange the gaieties of a palace for the fatigues of the field, and to fly into the arms of death, from the bosom of sensuality and voluptuousness. But more especially in those critical junctures, when the crown is at stake, and the majesty of the monarch, on the point of sinking into the subject, the springs of nature play with an extraordinary elasticity; the radiancy of the throne, glistening in the monarch's eyes, absorbs and eclipses the perception of danger: pride supplies the place of valour, and despair metamorphoses the coward into the hero.

In the vicinity of an army of thirty thousand men, master of the strong holds and garrisons of his realms, at the first report of the Prince of Orange's arrival in England, James the Second, with the apathy of a Stoic, or the timidity of an old woman, throws the royal seals into the Thames, disappears, leaves three kingdoms in the utmost anarchy and confusion, the reins of government without a hand to manage them, and his subjects uncertain to whom they are to transfer their allegiance.

Instances of the kind are scarce to be met with in the *chronicles of kings;* a hand that would not unsheath a sword in defence of three realms is better calculated for a muff than a sceptre. Queen Elizabeth, almost in sight of an army of fifty thousand Spaniards, reviews her troops, rides through the ranks, animates, incites, encourages her men: 'Behold, your queen! Victorious, I shall reward 'you; defeated, I will die with you.' But Buchanan's contrast of James the First to Queen Elizabeth, is applicable to James the Second.

Rex fuit Elizabeth, nunc vero regina Jacobus.
Error naturæ par in utroque fuit.

In English:

"Nature was mistaken in those two extraordinary productions: Elizabeth was "a man: James a woman."

Recalled by Tyrconnel from France to Ireland, our Alexander lays siege to Londonderry, from whence he is repelled by a Protestant minister, at the head of a handful of men half famished. This was a glorious contest between a king and a priest: the sword and the gown. *Cedant arma togæ.*

The banks of the Boyne are quite as inauspicious to his *laurels.* Here, contrary to the advice of his officers, he compels them to encounter a formidable army of fifty thousand veterans, commanded by the ablest generals of that age. Remark his orders and dispositions. With a select party of his army he places himself on Dunmore hill, out of cannon reach; and gives a strict charge to Sarsfield, (Lord Lucan) not to fire at his *son*, who was come sword in hand to deprive him of his crown. A boding omen of future victory! In battle, let a general ride up and down to animate his troops, never fire into his quarters; you will gain the field. Seeing the Irish, though dispirited by his partial commands, and unanimated by his example, repel the enemy, and keep the battle in suspense, he cries out, 'spare my English subjects, spare my English subjects.' Lo, the most beloved king of the Stuart race! Pious, and tender-hearted, he would not have scrupled to re-possess himself of the throne at the expence of Irish blood, but the purchase would have been too dear, when acquired with the loss of English subjects.

It was the duty of the Irish to fight for their king. But when they perceived that he preferred his son-in-law's life to their security, and his own interest, in my humble opinion, they were acquitted of their allegiance. It was his own choice. His daughter, queen Mary, during her husband's absence, ordered all Papists and reputed Papists, to depart ten miles from London. Her reign would have swelled the code of penal laws, and expanded the ten miles into a wider circuit, had not king William controuled the spirit of oppression, so co-unnatural to the Stuarts. Exposed to the power of Lewis the Fourteenth, ready to back the claims of

an abdicated king, still grasping at the remains of expiring royalty. William the Third never deprived the Catholics of their property. He even allowed the most part of the Catholic gentry the use of such arms as were necessary for their defence and diversion: a sword and a gun. Their total destruction was completed by the last sovereign of the Stuart line.

Queen Anne, by reducing the leases to thirty-one years, and introducing the bills of discovery, threw the nation into a convulsion, from whence it can never recover, until more lenient hands slacken the stiff chain of penal restraints.—Under the happiest of constitutions, she has made Ottoman slaves, and impressed one of her kingdoms with the traces of Turkish misery.

'Under this sort of government,' says Montesquieu, speaking of the Ottoman empire, 'nothing is repaired or improved. Houses are built only for the necessity of habitations; every thing is drawn from, but nothing restored to the earth: the ground lies untilled, and the whole country becomes a desart.' Whoever travels over the most part of Ireland, can see the description realized. One of her laws, whereby it is decreed, 'that where the son and heir of a Papist, shall become a Protestant, his father shall be tenant for life,' is the horror of Christendom, and an indelible stain on her memory—'Laws written in characters of blood,' says an illustrious member, in his speech on the Popery bills. This law effectually dissolves the ties of nature, *reverses* filial duty, and subjects a tender and aged father to the empire of a profligate son, who, for the sake of pleasure and dissolution, would subscribe the Alcoran in Constantinople, as soon as he would the thirty-nine articles in Dublin, and say with the Count of Bonneval, 'in turning Turk I have only exchanged my hat for a turban.' It is true, that her victorious generals have *graced* the annals of the queen; but in the eyes of a Christian, her inclemency and ductility shall for ever disgrace the history of the Stuarts.

Hitherto we have a retrospective view of our obligations to those our royal *benefactors:* let us now look forward to the agreeable scene, and enchanting prospect of riches and blessings, we expect from their restoration.

In reality, Sir, a dear bought experience has broken this charm that bewitched our ancestors in favour of the Stuarts. Whilst they were our kings, we exerted ourselves to support them on the throne, more from principle than faction; and had other monarchs swayed the sceptre, we would have done the same. In a word, we fell with our kings, and the very offspring of those kings have chained us closer to the ground. Now the tide of those fatal commotions has subsided. This tumult that distracted the nation in the Stuart's reign is allayed. Are we to quit the reality in pursuit of a shadow? What would we have gained, had the Pretender been crowned at Westminster? An aggravation of our yoke, and new calamities? The penal laws, relaxed in their execution by the clemency of government, would have been revived with new vigour. The edge of persecution, blunted by the very humanity of our fellow-subjects, would have been new tempered and sharpened.

You will answer, perhaps, that such usage could not be expected from a *Catholic Prince*. Folly! pardon the expression. You know that the throne is the most dazzling object of human ambition. Though a great distance from its steps, and the impossibility of obtaining it renders the most part of mortals insensible to its charms, yet in regard to those who are entitled to it by their birth, it is a magnet that attracts their hearts, the great idol, to which they would sacrifice their very blood, and the water of Lethe, erasing by its oblivious qualities all impressions of friendship, gratitude, and even religion. Of this, history, both sacred and profane, afford several instances. Athalia murdered the princes of the royal house of Judah. Tullia drove her chariot over her father's body, and dyed its wheels in his blood, from an eagerness to be saluted queen. In the time of the crusades, a Catholic prince was found in the number of the slain, with the marks of the circumcision on his body. He expected the kingdom of Jerusalem from Saladin; and this *fervent* Christian, who a few years before would have spilt his blood in defence of Christ's sepulchre, sold Christ himself, for the dominion of a city in which he had been crucified.

I do not mean, Sir, that any of our regal candidates would turn Turks for the sake of a crown. But certain I

am, that the transition is easy from Popery to Protestantism, and from Protestantism to Popery, when a diadem is the reward of conversion. In my humble opinion, Charles the Third would have removed Pope and Popery out of his way to the throne. To clear himself from the suspicion of a Popish cancer, the oppression of Papists would have been the best detersive. A Catholicon very familiar to the Stuarts!

Perhaps I pass a rash judgment on this cherished twig of the Stuart stock: if so, I retract. But all we expect from him is the liberty to *fast and pray;* this we enjoy without his mediation, and it would be madness to forfeit.

Incapable and unwilling to hurt the public, willing and incapable to serve it; equally destitute of property and arms to defend it, our duty is confined to passive loyalty, inforced by religion. Let interest and the liberty of purchasing step in as an active principle, you will not find one Catholic in the kingdom but will be as sanguine as yourselves in the defence of his substance, and the common cause, against Pope or Pretender. We daily see two brothers fight with the animosity of open enemies, for a legacy or a spot of ground.—We read of Popes, who in defence of their territories, have entered into leagues with Protestant princes against Catholic powers. Property then is so interwoven with self-preservation, that few or none will run the hazard of losing it in compliment to another, were he even a saint; and of all mortals the Stuarts are the least entitled to the sacrifice of our acknowledgment.

Yet, as the frowardness of superiors does not avert their authority, and as the descendants of bad princes may have a *rightful* claim, one point more remains to be discussed, viz. Whether we can in conscience *renounce all allegiance unto* the grandson of James the Second, whose abdication of the throne has been the effect of *fear and compulsion?* Has not the son *a right* to the estate of which his father has been deprived by force? And in opposing this *right* do I not commit a flagrant injustice?

This important question is to be solved by the fundamental laws of the realm, general principles, grounded on impartial reason, and the ordinary dispensation of Provi-

dence, directing the revolutions and vicissitudes of human affairs.

From the earliest times, the laws have decreed, that although the crown be hereditary, yet the right of accession is not *indefeasible*. The English have defeated, and altered the succession as early as the time of Edward the Confessor, who was chosen king during the life of the lawful heir. The history of England affords several instances of the kind, a long time before the accession of the Stuarts to the throne. The law both in present and past times, is, and has been, 'that the crown is hereditary in the wearer: that 'the king and both houses of parliament can defeat this 'hereditary right, and by particular limitations exclude the 'immediate heir, and vest the inheritance in any one else.' Thus not only the Pretender, but even the present Prince of Wales can be excluded from the throne, with the consent of the king, lords, and commons.

Grotius, a learned and sanguine stickler for *indefeasible right*, though he cannot agree that the son of a dethroned king can be lawfully excluded, yet is forced to acknowledge, that the same son, if not born whilst his father was in possession, can be deprived of his right to the throne with the consent of the people, *because such a prince*, says he, *has no acquired right*. 'Illud interest inter natos et nascituros, quod nas-'cituris nondum quæsitum sit jus, atque adeo iis auferri 'possit populi voluntate.' *Grot. de jure belli. lib.* 2. *c.* 7. 26. This decides for ever the fate of Charles the Third, who was born a long time after his grandfather's expulsion. It is moreover grounded on the clearest principles of reason.

In effect, does reason allow that subjects should be distracted, between kings in actual possession of the throne, and the grandsons and great grandsons of kings who had formerly enjoyed it? Bound by the law of God to pay tribute to, and obey the king, whose image is stamped on his coin: *Cujus est hæc imago?* Bound by the dictates of conscience to assert the claims of his rival: to pull down their king with one hand, to support him on the throne with the other. Carrying within themselves two opposite laws, which mixing and encountering like certain chemical liquors,

raise a fermentation that cannot be allayed to the end of time.

Let us suppose that Charles Stuart *had a right* to the throne; his posterity (if ever he chance to have any) to the last generation will claim the same. Let us suppose the Hanoverian line in possession to the end of time. Lo, a curious sight! The frame of government turning on two hinges, without being supported by either; two mathematical lines always approaching, without ever touching, and all future generations balanced and suspended between both, without knowing which of the two to incline to. Good sense, the law of nature, or the general good of mankind, to which the claims and interest of one man should be subordinate, do they admit such rigorous enquiry?

Celebrated objection of civilians, canonists, and divines:—

'Time is no active principle. Every thing is done in 'time, but nothing by it; and a long prescription, without a 'lawful title, is no lenitive to the alarmed conscience of 'the possessor, nor bar to the claims of the dispossessed.' The civil law has decided so. *L.* 3. 11. 3. *ff. de acq. vel amit. poss.* 'Non capit longa possessione qui scit alienum 'esse.' And the canon law, *Cap. possessor de reg. juris in* 6. 'Possessor malæ fidei ullo tempore non præscribit.'

Answered: If a long prescription, without an original title, cannot secure the consciences of kings and subjects, God help the world! For great kingdoms, if traced back to their origin, are great robberies. 'Sine justitia magna 'regna sunt magna lacrocinia.'* By this rule, the Stuarts had no *right* to the throne of England: for their original title was defective, as derived from William the Conqueror, an usurper, or from the ancient Saxons, who plundered and dispossessed the Britons. How can we calm the consciences of the Dutch, Portuguese, &c. formerly the subjects of Spain? I believe the most scrupulous amongst them are unconcerned for the rights of their former masters.

However, I acknowledge that time alone, without some concurrent cause, cannot legalize a prescription. But in regard to kings and the allegiance due from their subjects, a great number of reasons supply the deficiency of the original

* St. Augustine.

title requisite to commence a prescription, viz. the consent of the greatest and wisest part of a nation, the acquiescence of the whole community—the peace of the public, disturbed by factions and civil wars, ever and always attendant on changes in government—the general good of mankind; inconsistent with the revival of old claims—in fine, the dispensation of a just God, who visited on Saul's posterity, their father's cruel treatment of the Gibeonites; and who positively declares, that 'he wrests the sceptre from one family, 'to lodge it in the hands of another, in punishment of former 'crimes.' *Transfert sceptrum de regno et de gente, ad populum alterum.*—'When the political law has obliged a family to 'renounce the succession,' says the president Montesquieu, 'it is absurd to insist on the restitutions drawn from the 'civil law. It is ridiculous to pretend to decide the rights of 'kingdoms, of nations, and of the whole globe, by the same 'maxims on which we should determine the right of a gutter 'between individuals.'*

Further, king James the Second's quitting England, without even appointing a regent, and his subsequent behaviour at the Boyne, is an abdication of the throne, or else there never has been a resignation of royalty. *Fear!* He was intrepid enough before his son-in-law became his competitor; and though prince William wanted neither courage nor wisdom, yet his prowess was not so famed in the history of the times, as to strike terror into a tolerable general, much less into the heart of a king, whom an exalted rank, the love of his subjects, and paternal authority, should have animated with courage and resolution. Old captain O'Regan was not afraid when he desired king William's officers 'to 'change generals, and fight the battle over again.'†

In times of invasion, thrones cannot be secured without bloodshed. If the fear of a ball cannot dispense subjects with fighting for their prince, the prince is bound to share the danger, or at least to remain in some part of the kingdom to watch and direct their operations. If the safety of the people be the supreme law, *salus populi suprema esto*, and that kings are appointed guardians of the property and lives of their subjects, who in the beginning could have instituted a

* Montesquieu's Spirit of Laws, Vol. II. page 193.
† Hist. of Eng. in a series of letters, &c.

republican as well as a regal government, the king who prefers his personal safety to that of his subjects, flies into a foreign country, and abandons them a prey to the first occupant, forfeits all right to their allegiance. The law forbids the use of *two weights and two measures*, and there is no justice without equality.

To the Irish, then, king William with propriety might have applied Curio's speech to Domitius's soldiers: 'But 'did you desert Domitius, or Domitius his soldiers? Were 'you not ready to endure the last extremities, whilst he 'privately endeavoured to escape? And how can the oath 'any longer oblige you, when he to whom you swore, 'having thrown aside all marks of consular dignity, became 'a private person, and a captive to another?'*

Several generations have decayed and succeeded since James the Second has abdicated the throne. Time expunges the impressions of the nearest and dearest connections. We cheerfully converse in walking over the graves of friends, for whom we formerly cried. Had then our attachment to the Stuarts been formed of links of steel, it could not endure to the present generation.

But after having expatiated so long on the claims of a family, commencing in our misfortune, and concluding in our ruin, let us attribute to a superior cause the revolutions of kingdoms, and in the very sport of human passions trace the footsteps of divine Providence. 'That long concatena- 'tion of particular causes, which make and unmake em- 'pires, depends upon the secret orders of divine Providence,' says the bishop of Meaux. 'God from the highest Heavens 'holds the reigns of all the kingdoms of the earth: he hath 'all hearts in his hands: sometimes he gives a loose to 'them; and thereby moveth all mankind. He it is who 'prepares effects in their remotest causes, and he it is who 'strikes those great strokes, the counter-stroke whereof is 'of such extensive consequence. Let us talk no more of 'chance, or of fortune. What is chance in regard to our 'uncertain counsels, is a concerted design in a higher coun- 'sel. Thereby is verified the saying of the apostle, that 'God is the blessed and only potentate, the King of kings,

* Cæsar de Bell. Civ. l 2. c. 13.

'and Lord of lords, who causes all revolutions by an immu-
'table counsel; who gives and takes away power, who
'transfers it from one man to another, from one house to
'another, from one people to another, to shew, that they all
'have it only borrowed, and that it is he alone in whom it
'naturally resides?'* Let us then talk no more of the Stuarts, but bid them an eternal farewell.

ART. IV.

'And I do swear that I do reject and detest as unchristian
'and impious to believe, that it is lawful to murder or
'destroy any person or persons whatsoever: for or under
'pretence of their being heretics, and also that unchris-
'tian and impious principle, that no faith is to be kept
'with heretics.'

Any attempt to prove this article would be an idle task, whereas we are sure never to convince, when we attempt to prove things too clear. In a word to buy a piece of cloth, and instead of paying to murder the draper, 'for or under 'pretence of his being a heretic,' is a doctrine unknown to the most relaxed of our casuists We appeal to the gentlemen of different persuasions, to whom restitutions are daily made, through the hands of the Catholic clergy, and to such of them as have been stopt on the high road, whether the robber has enquired into their religion? Murder is against the fifth commandment; injustice and fraud against the seventh. To suppose then that it is a principle of Roman Catholics to murder or cheat 'any person or persons 'whatsoever, for or under the pretence of their being heretics,' is to suppose them ignorant of the commandments of God.

Since the time of the emperor Theodosius, laws have been enacted concerning heresy. Lawyers and divines of both communions have been divided in their opinions: Geneva and London, Calvinist magistrates, and Protestant kings, have concurred with the Spanish inquisitors in blazing the fagot, and forestalling the rigour of eternal justice. The writ *De Hæretico Comburendo* (of committing heretics to the flames) was in force down to the reign of Charles the Second, and has met with

† Bossuett's Histoire Universelle, Vol. 2. p. 403.

a learned apologist in Calvin. By the statute and common laws of England, some punishments are still in force against heretics; but how far these and severer punishments inflicted by the civil and imperial laws, are *impious and unchristian*, kings, not subjects, are interested to determine.

In every Christian country, the Christian religion is a part of the national laws; on the other hand, heresy, in its loosest latitude comprehends errors subversive not only of revealed religion, but moreover of morality, and justice; such as the error of the Priscillianists, authorizing false oaths; and the errors of those who give loose to private and public vices, by denying all rewards and punishments beyond the grave. Should then the supreme magistrate, to whom the right of the sword is reserved, determine the degree of punishment, and instead of imprisonment, banishment, &c. make it capital, let his conscience condemn or acquit him. Every subject should still 'reject and detest, as unchristian and impious to 'believe, that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person 'or persons whatsoever, for or under the pretence of their 'being heretics.' We are never to arrogate to ourselves the power of life and death, which God has entrusted to the legislators, and to them alone.

To Catholic and Protestant magistrates let us, however, venture to propose the advice of St. Bernard: 'Hæretici 'capiantur non armis, sed argumentis;'* 'Let heretics be 'convinced not with blows, but arguments;' and the opinion of St. Augustine, in his letter to Count. Marcellin: 'No doc-'trine should strike a deeper horror in the human heart, 'than that which teacheth that it is lawful to kill any person 'or persons under pretence of heresy, and under the mask of 'religion, spread the dismal seeds of the greatest evils in the 'Christian world,—murders, dissentions, wars.' In fine, the opinion of a learned Protestant Bishop: 'Among all the he-'heresies this age has spawned, there is not one more con-'trary to the whole design of religion, and more destructive 'of mankind, than is that bloody opinion of defending reli-'gion by arms, and of forcible resistance upon the colour of 'religion.'†

* Bernard, in Cant. Serm. 62.

† Bishop of Sarum, Preface to the Vindication of the Church and State of Scotland.

However upon closer inspection into those persecutions which have changed Europe into a scene of Gothic barbarity, we shall find a combination of various causes, amongst which religion was a pretext, passion and policy the main springs.

Examine all your former wars, (commonly stiled wars of 'religion)' says the most famous writer of the age, 'you will 'see the first sparks of them kindled in the dark recesses of 'the court, or in the ambitious breasts of the grandees.— 'Matters were first embroiled and entangled by the intrigues 'and debates of the cabinet; and afterwards the leading men 'raised the people in the name of God.'

In effect, Sir, under the empire of grace, our passions retain a fatal liberty, and even uniformity of belief does not always preclude factious divisions. Whigs and Tories, Guelphes and Gibelines,* may repeat the same creed, and be still divided. The Sicilians and French went to the same churches to sing the *hallelujahs* upon an Easter Sunday, when soon after the air began to resound with the groans of bleeding victims, and the harmonious sounds of chiming bells. Had the sufferers been of a different persuasion from that of their aggressors, religion would appear as the chief character in the tragedy, when represented by some of our English historians, especially Sir John Temple, who spreads the wild theatre of imaginary massacres, abuses the public faith, and blends the mendacity of heathen Greece into the history of Christians. '*Et quidquid, Græcia* '*mendax peccat in historia.*'†

To clear religion from those bloody imputations, let us contrast the present with the past times; the Huguenots, formerly victims to the policy of Catharine de Medicis, live now in peace and opulence, and enjoy their rich estates in Poitou, Lower Normandy, &c. The order of military merit is instituted to reward the valour of their officers: and in France no man's religion is a bar to his promotion in the career of military honours, whereas nothing is more common than to see the French legions commanded by Protestant Generals. Here in Ireland, the Catholics, formerly driven by thousands into woods and caverns, and their clergy hunted like wild

* Two formidable factions in Italy.
† Juvenal, Sat. 10.

beasts, live unmolested, though debarred of the privilege of becoming soldiers or mayor's serjeants. The respective religions of the two kingdoms are now what they were then: whence proceeds this happy transition from persecution to lenity? Not from the Christian religion, whose spirit never changes, but from the different characters of its professors.

The French Huguenots are now under Lewis XVI. They have been formerly under the sway of a Medicis. Formerly under the Stuarts, we are now governed by the Brunswics. Our magistrates are Protestants, but quite different from those who, instead of redressing grievances, used to foment the rebellion, with a view of enriching themselves by the spoils of oppression. In fine, Sir, let us divest ourselves of passion: religion will never arm our hand with the poniard.

ART. V.

'I further declare, that it is no article of my faith, and that 'I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion, that princes 'excommunicated by the Pope and council, or by any au- 'thority of the see of Rome, or by any authority whatso- 'ever, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or 'by any person whatsoever: and I do promise, that I will 'not hold, maintain, or abet any such opinion, or any other 'opinion, contrary to what is expressed in this decla- 'ration.'

This article of the test requires a peculiar discussion: as the Pope's deposing power has caused such confusion in Europe, during the great struggles between the priesthood and empire, and is often an engine employed in parliament, to defeat the good intentions of the members, who, from principles of humanity and zeal for the prosperity of the kingdom, endeavour to remove the heavy yoke of penal restraints. The question is—Whether the deposing power be an article of the Catholic faith? For my heart startles and my hand recoils at the words, 'murdered by their subjects.' As if the principles of any sect of Christians authorized a gloomy ruffian to plunge the dagger in the royal breast. To determine the question, let us enquire, first, into the doctrine of

the Church concerning the deposing power: secondly, into its origin.

Resistance to princes has been an early charge against the Church: and from her infancy down to this day, her pastors and doctors have repelled the calumny. An *imputed* doctrine then, yet still disclaimed, can never be an article of her faith.

It is true that the concessions of princes to the Apostolic see—an excessive veneration for the first Pastor of the Church—flattery in some—rash zeal in others—have raised up Bellarmin and some other champions for the deposing power, beyond the Alps. But the deviations of some individuals should be considered as spots in the sun, or the misconduct of a citizen whose fault should not be charged upon a large community.

The apologists of the deposing power (now grown obsolete) are few: and their doctrine must either stand or fall with the evidence or inevidence of their arguments, unsupported by authority, and contradicted by the practice and doctrine of all ages and nations.

In the Apostles time, the Jews began to revolt, and sow the seeds of that rebellion which assembled the Roman eagles round their walls, and involved their nation in final destruction: their great pretence was—the seeming impropriety of the subjection of God's chosen people to a heathen dominion: and, as the first converts sprung from the Jews, the Heathens confounded together Jews and Christians, and charged them alike with the doctrine of resistance to subordination and government. The great St. Paul vindicates the Christians, and lays down for a general rule, 'that every 'soul must be subject to higher powers; that there is no 'power but from God, and, that those who resist receive damnation unto themselves.'* Should any one reply, that, 'the church has more power over Christian kings, as 'by baptism they become her children,' it can be easily answered, that dominion and temporal power are founded in free-will and the laws of nations, but not conferred nor taken away by a spiritual regeneration: and Bellarmin himself is forced to acknowledge, that 'the Gospel deprives no man of

* Romans, xiii.

'his right and dominion, but gets him a new right to an 'eternal kingdom.'*

The apostolical constitutions, whether genuine or spurious, are certainly of an ancient date, and give us great insight into the discipline of the primitive times. They command 'to fear the king as God's institution and ordinance.'† 'The 'Christians worship God only,' says St. Justin Martyr, 'they are subject to the emperors in all things else.'‡ 'By 'whose command men are born,' says St. Irenæus, 'by his 'commands also are kings ordained, as suits the circum-'stances of those over whom they are set: some for the 'amendment and benefit of their subjects; and some for 'fear and punishment; for reproof and contempt as the 'people shall have deserved; the just judgment of God 'reaching equally to all.' Tertullian, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Gregory Nyssen, Optatus Milevitanus, in fine, all the fathers declare, 'that kings have none above 'them, but God alone, who made them kings; that God 'bestows the heavenly felicity on the godly only, but the 'kingdoms of the earth on both godly and ungodly: and 'that to him alone, the cruel Marius and the gracious 'Cæsar, Augustus, the best of princes, Nero, one of 'the worst, Constantine the Christian, and Julian, the 'apostate, are equally indebted for their authority and 'power.'

If from the fathers you continue the long chain of venerable antiquity through the successive reigns of the Roman pontiffs, you will find the *deposing power* assumed by few; the pre-eminence of kings, and their dependence on God alone, asserted by the mildest and most learned, and those by far the greatest number.

St. Gregory the Great not only disclaims any temporal power over kings, but even acknowledges himself their subject. The Emperor insists on the publication of a law. The Pope writes to him: 'I being subject to your command, 'have caused the law to be sent into several parts, and be-'cause the law agrees not with God omnipotent, I have by 'letter informed my serene lord. Wherefore I have in both

* Bellarmin. de Rom. Pontif. lib. v. c. 3.
† Lib. VII. ‡ Apolog. 2.

'done what I ought, obeyed the Emperor, and not con-'cealed what I thought for God.' Eleutherius, Anastasius 2, Galasius, Symmachus, Gregory 2, Leo 4, Nicholas 3, Adrian 1, Nicholas 2, John 8, and Celestin 3, call the king 'God's vicar on earth:' forbid the priest to 'usurp the regal dignity;' and confine the power of the 'Church 'to the dispensation of divine, that of the prince 'to the administration of temporal things.'

If you consult cardinals, who have heightened the glory of their purple by their learning and piety, you will meet with numerous and steady assertors of regal independence. 'I pre-suppose what is known even to the vulgar,' says Cardinal Cusanus, 'that the imperial celsitude is independent of 'the sacerdotal power, having an immediate dependence 'on God.* Between the kingdom and priesthood, the 'proper offices of each are distinct, that the king may make 'use of the arms of the world, and the priest be girt with 'the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God,' says Cardinal Damianus.† In answer to some objections drawn from the conduct of a Pope, regular and exemplary in other respects, but too ready to interfere in temporal concerns, this great man replies: 'I say what I think, that neither Peter obtained the 'apostolical principality, because he 'denied Christ, nor David deserved the oracle of prophecy, 'because he defiled another man's bed.' As much as to say, that this Pope committed a fault, which he afterwards cancelled by repentance.

If you still fear that the long-famed British throne should be overturned by syllogisms, or that the jars of schoolmen may silence the English cannon, (for you have nothing more to apprehend from the Pope) I can march to your aid a formidable army of scholastic divines, armed *cap-a-pee* in support of regal pre-eminence.—Navar, Durandus, Joan, Paris, Almain, Gerson, Victoria, Thom. Wald. Anton. de Roselli, Ægidius, Rom. Ambros. Catharinus, &c. &c. some of whom qualify the deposing power with the epithets of *horrible and seditious:* and others style it *downright madness.*‡ Add to the

* Cus. l. 3 Conc. c. 5. † Damianus, Lib. iv. Epist. 9.
‡ Ambros. Cathar. in 13. Rom. Roselli. de pot. pap.

foregoing authorities, the Council of Constance in the year 1415. The declaration of the provincial congregation of the Jesuits at Ghent, in the year 1681, and that of the clergy of France in 1682; who declare that 'kings and princes by 'God's ordinance are not subject in temporals to any eccle- 'siastical power, and that they cannot be deposed directly 'nor indirectly, by the authority of the keys of the Church, 'neither can their subjects be freed from fealty and obedi- 'ence, nor absolved from their oath of allegiance.' 'Reges 'ergo et principes in temporalibus nulli ecclesiasticæ potestati 'Dei ordinatione subjici, neque authoritate clavium ecclesiæ 'directe vel indirecte deponi, aut illorum subditos eximi a 'fide atque obedientia, ac præstito fidelitatis sacramento solvi 'posse: eamque sententiam, ut verbo Dei, patrum traditioni, 'et sanctorum exemplis consomam, omnino retinemdam.'* Even in the canon law it is declared, that 'kings acknow- 'ledge no superior in temporals:' and, that 'appeals con- 'cerning temporals should not be brought to the Pope's tri- 'bunal.'†

In fine, the deposing power was so unknown in primitive times, that Bellarmin, who has ransacked the works of the fathers, and enriched himself with their spoils, in defending the doctrine of the Church, could cite none but St. Bernard in support of the novel doctrine of deposition: and yet this father, who mentions two *swords* in the Church, only means that in the Church are Christian princes invested with the right of the sword: For, in writing to Pope Eugenius, the saint uses these remarkable words: 'Earthly kingdoms have 'their judges, princes and kings. Why do you thrust your 'sickle into another man's harvest? St. Peter could not give 'what he had not: did he give dominion? It is the saying 'of the Lord in the gospel, the kings of the Gentiles have 'dominion over them, but you not so. It is plain dominion 'is forbid to apostles. Go now and dare usurp either domi- 'nion with the apostleship, or with the apostleship dominion. 'You are plainly forbid the one. If you will have both, you 'will lose both: you will be of the number of those of whom

* Declaratio Cleri Gallicani, anno 1682;
† Cap. si duobus. Extra de appel.

'God complains, they have been princes, and I knew them 'not.'*

Bellarmin's misapplication of St. Bernard's text, was not the only mistake his antagonists have censured. His wild conjecture, that 'the Christians would have deposed Nero 'and Julian the Apostate, and the like, had they had the 'power to do so,' raised the indignation of the Catholic universities. 'Quod si Christiani olim non deposuerint Nero-'nem, et Julianum Apostatem, et similes, id fuit quia defue-'rant vires temporales Christianis.'† The decision was considered by the Catholic divines, as more becoming the scarlet robe of the stern Brutus, who beheaded his children for siding with their king, than the purple of the Christian Cardinal. It was *revised* by the university of Paris; *corrected* by the hangman with a blazing fagot; and contradicted by the unexceptionable testimony of Tertullian and St. Augustine. 'Should we want numbers or forces, if we had a 'a mind to be open enemies?' says Tertullian. 'Are the 'Moors, the Marcomans, and Parthians, and whatever na-'tions of one place, and confined to their own limits, more 'than those of the whole world? We are but men of yes-'terday; and yet have filled all the places you have—your 'cities, islands, and castles, boroughs, councils, and camp 'itself, your tribes, courts, the senate and the market. We have left you only the temples. For what war are we not fit and ready, (even though we were inferior in number) 'who endure death so willingly, if in this discipline it 'were as lawful to kill as to be killed?'‡ 'They could 'at their pleasure have deposed Julian,' says St. Augustine, 'but would not because they were subject for necessity, 'not only to avoid anger, but for conscience and love, and 'because our Lord so commanded.'§ In effect, Sir, laying aside the truth of history, had Peter and Paul been as willing to depose kings, *for the glory of God, and the propagation of religion*, as some of our modern zealots of all communions, how could Nero have withstood those Apostles, whose word alone was to Ananias and Saphira a

* St. Bernard, Lib. 2. de Consid.
† Bellarmin, de Rom. Pontiff, Lib. v. c. 7.
‡ Tert. Apol. c. 37. § In Psal. 124.

messenger of death, struck the magicians blind, and raised the dead to life?

I say, *of all communions:* for in every communion there are men of deposing principles, which their religion disclaims. 'Iliacos intra muros peccatur et extra.' Doleman, Buchanan, Milton, Sam. Johnson, Hobbes, Hoadly, Locke, and several other advocates of republican principles, and sticklers for popular rights, are more dangerous than Bellarmin, who disowns the deposing power, except in the case of a prince forcing his subjects to change their religion: 'Si enim tales principes non conentur fideles a fide 'avertere, non existimo posse eos privari suo dominio.'* A *salvo* which, I hope, will remove all umbrage and suspicion from the minds of our governors: as they do not reckon persecution in the number of their cardinal virtues: even if they did, resistance is not a principle of the Catholic religion.

But I am clearly of opinion, that had Mr. Locke, the wisest and most moderate of those English writers, been an officer in Julian's army, he would have *reasoned* the soldiers into open rebellion. He that compares subjects, who would brook the violence and oppression of their supreme ruler, to fools, 'who take care to avoid what mischiefs may 'be done them by pole-cats or foxes, but are content, nay 'think it safety to be devoured by lions,'† and illustrates his doctrine with the following example: 'he that hath autho-'rity to seize my person in the street, may be opposed as a 'thief and a robber, if he endeavours to break into my house 'to execute a writ, notwithstanding that I know he has such 'a warrant, and such a legal authority as will empower him 'to arrest me abroad. And why this should not hold in the 'highest, as well as in the most inferior magistrate, I would 'gladly be informed.'‡

Here you see a philosophical freedom breaking the shackles of restraint and ceremony, and under the pretence of redressing imaginary grievances, introducing real mischief and a state of nature, wherein the most factious and daring adventurers would take the lead. 'For this devolution of power

* Bellarmin, de Rom. Pontif. l. v. c. 7.
† Locke on Government, page 253.
‡ Ibid. page 343.

'to the people at large, includes in it a dissolution of the 'whole form of government established by that people,' says Judge Blackstone, 'reduces all the members to their origi- 'nal state of equality, and by annihilating the sovereign 'power, repeals all positive laws whatsoever before enacted. 'No human laws will therefore suppose a case, which at 'once must destroy all law.'* 'Woe to all the princes upon 'earth,' says a Protestant archbishop, 'if this doctrine *(of 'resistance)* be true and becometh popular; if the multitude 'believe this, the prince not armed with the scales of the Le- 'viathan, can never be safe from the spears and barbed irons, 'which ambition, presumed interest, and malice will sharpen, 'and passionate violence will throw against him. If the 'beast we speak of but knows its own strength, it will never 'be managed.'†

'But the same equality of justice and freedom that obliged 'me to lay open this,' says the Bishop of Sarum, 'ties me to 'tax all those who pretend a great heat against Rome, and 'value themselves on their abhorring all the doctrines and 'practices of that church, and yet have carried along with 'them one of their most pestiferous opinions,‡ pretending re- 'formation when they would bring all under confusion; and 'vouching the case and work of God, when they were de- 'stroying the authority he had set up, and opposing those 'impowered by him; and the more piety and devotion such 'daring pretenders put on, it still brings the greater stain and 'imputation on religion, as if it gave a patronacy to those 'practices it so plainly condemns.'§ The borders of the Thames and Tweed afford then advocates for the deposing power, as well as the banks of the Tiber and Po.

On the banks of the Tiber a bigotted divine vests in the Pope an indirect power over wicked kings. On the banks of the Thames an enthusiastic Englishman vests in the subject a direct power over his sovereign. Religion points out an intermediate course, without giving a patronacy to reveries,

* Blackstone's Comm. b. I. p. 162.
† Creed of Mr. Hobbes, examined by the archbishop of Canterbury.
‡ The Bishop's heat against Rome often mistakes or disguises their real opinions.
§ Sermon of Subjection.

and mankind shall always find their account, better in mediums, than in extremes. The doctrine of the Italian has fattened the German soil with dead bodies, and induced a Pope* to attempt placing his flesh and blood on the throne of the Cæsars. The doctrine of the Englishman has placed dray-men and coblers in the seats of British peers; and by an extraordinary vicissitude in bringing a king to the block in England, raised a tailor to the throne in Germany.†

Such are the fruits of those two systems, equally pernicious to the safety of kings, and the peace of society. Their respective authors, in striking from the plain road of the Christian doctrine, 'Let every soul be subject to 'higher powers,' into the airy paths of speculation, have busied themselves in pursuit of a plan the most alarming to mankind. Kings were beheaded, and others deposed, before some of those authors had published their works, it is true: but are they the more justifiable in publishing a doctrine which may tincture the scaffold a second time? The difference between them is, that the Englishman, in terse and popular language, engages the imagination: adorns his subjects by a long chain of deduction: makes truth bend to arguments, reality to appearance; and is read by all. In this great arsenal, every common reader can find arms to reduce his king to reason; the shipwright and carpenter are enabled by the rules of political logic, to trim the vessel of state, and steer it through the unbounded ocean of constitutional liberty. But the ultramontane divine bristling with barbarous Latin, is not read by one in three millions. Powdered with dust, and stretched on the shelf of a college library, he sleeps as sound as Endimion in his cave, and more is the pity: for his doctrine of the deposing power is founded on as solid proofs as the history of that Spaniard who made a voyage to the moon: and displayed in a style not inferior to that of Valentine and Orson. Of his style and arguments I send you the following sample:

'Probatur per similitudinem ad artem *frænifactoriam*‡ et

* Alexander VI.

† John of Leyden, a taylor, made king of Munster.

‡ New-coined Latin, much of the same date with the deposing power.

'equestrem. Ut enim duæ ille artes sunt inter se diversæ, 'quia distincta habent objecta, et subjecta, et actiones; et 'tamen quia finis unius ordinatue ad finem alterius, ideo una, 'alteri præst, et leges ei præscribit: ita videntur potestas 'ecclesiastica et politica, distinctæ potestates esse; et tamen 'una alteri subordinata, quoniam finis unius ad finem alte-'rius natura sua refertur.' 'That the Pope has an indirect 'power in temporals is proved by the example of the art of 'making bridles, and the art of riding: for as these two arts 'are different, because they have different objects, and sub-'jects, and actions: and notwithstanding, because the end of 'one is appointed for the end of the other, therefore one pre-'sides over the other, and prescribes laws to it: in like man-'ner the ecclesiastical and political powers seem to be distinct 'powers, and the one nevertheless subordinate to the other, 'because the end of the one is by its own nature referred to 'the end of the other.'

There, Sir, is *learned* gibberish, saddling the Pope on the backs of kings, by Aristotle's metaphysics, the *object, subject, action, and relation, and end of bridle-making.*

Another advocate for the deposing power disapproves the simile: 'because, says he, very gravely, 'if the art of riding 'were taken away, bridles would be useless: but the political 'power can subsist without the ecclesiastical.' 'Si enim non 'sit ars equestris, supervacanea est ars frænorum faciendo-'rum.'* An attempt to rectify the lameness of the comparison, by one quite as lame. If I had not the authority of a cardinal to apologize for an absurdity, I should not mention it, for fear of being censured: but I expect, that, with his eminence's passport, it will be received by the public.—He compares the Pope to a shepherd, and the king to *aris.* 'Pastori est potestas triplex: una circa lupos, altera circa 'arietes, tertia circa oves: unde debet arietem furiosum de-'pellere.'†

You have in these two similies as solid arguments in favour of the deposing power, as Albertus Phigius and Bellarmin have ever advanced in support of their hypothesis: and to them and their authors, I grant the same passport the satirist granted Hannibal in crossing the Alps.

'I, demens, et sævas curre per Alpes,
'Ut pueris placeas, et declamatio fias.'‡

* Bellarmin, lib. v. de Rom. Pontif. † Bellarmin, ibidem. ‡ Juvenal, sat. x.

You are to expect some Scripture, in like manner: for there never has been an error, how monstrous soever, but Scripture was quoted to give it some colour. Arians, Eutychians, Nestorians have wrested the sacred writings to a wrong sense. The advocates for the deposing power have done the same. They quote St. Paul, who blames the Corinthians for pleading before heathen magistrates. This proves that you and I could depose a king, because he would advise our neighbour to avoid troublesome and scandalous law-suits, and leave the decision to the arbitration of two honest neighbours. 'Jehoiada, the high priest, ordered queen Athalia to be 'slain.* Ergo, the Pope has an indirect power over bad 'kings.'

This proves a *direct* power, not only to depose, but to murder them: a power which neither Bellarmin nor any Catholic divine has ever vouched. Second: Athalia, who had murdered all the princes of the royal house of Judah, except Joash, was no longer queen, when the sentence was executed on her: for the young prince was crowned in the temple, and recognized by his subjects. His minority could not have deprived him of the right of the sword: and Jehoiada acted as minister of state, not in his pontifical character. This evinces Bellarmin's blunder in confounding together the queen and subject, the pontiff and counsellor. Third: during the six years she swayed the sceptre, none of her subjects revolted against her, much less did the pious pontiff absolve them from their allegiance, though she re-established Baal's worship, and maintained his priests in the temple of the true God. A circumstance which Bellarmin should have attended to, had he a mind to read his condemnation. Solomon deposed Abiathar, the high priest: will Bellarmin grant me the liberty to infer from this fact, that kings can depose Popes?

Such are the ridiculous shifts to which the patrons of a bad cause are inevitably reduced! Wild and unnatural similies, or facts that prove too much, and can be justly retorted on themselves. Am I accountable for their folly? Or must an

* Fourth Book of Kings.

Irish Catholic starve, because an Italian wrote nonsense in bad Latin, two hundred years ago?

Had he not slackened the reins of an enthusiastic imagination, and let it loose to its random flights, he could have spared himself the trouble of soaring to heaven, in pursuit of this offspring of human ambition, or the zeal of earthly kings. For that the deposing power originated either in privileges granted by pious zeal, or covenants entered into and sealed by ambition, history leaves no room to doubt, and religion forbids to believe otherwise.

Let us begin at home. Inas, king of the West Saxons, renders his kingdom tributary to the Holy See. This concession paves the way to future claims. Henry the Second solicits and obtains a bull from Pope Adrian, in order to invade Ireland. The Pope grants it: but, in blessing this new dish that is to be served on the English monarch's table, he carves his own portion. And why not? The one had as good a right to it as the other.

It is inserted in the bull, that 'the annual pension of one 'penny from every house, should be saved to St. Peter.' If the holy father and his *dear and illustrious son*, as he styles him, had afterwards quarrelled about the spoils, the religion of the subject should not be concerned in the dispute. King John, in his contestations with Philip Augustus of France, appeals to the Pope, and renders him the arbiter of rights that should be decided by the sword. The French monarch lays in his exceptions to the Pope's tribunal, as incompetent in such a case. The Englishman chooses a master. Lo, the gradual progression of the Pope's temporal power in Great Britain. It takes its first rise from the piety,—acquires additional degrees of strength by ambition,—and is confirmed by the weakness of English monarchs. Hence queen Elizabeth's excommunication, and the absolution of her subjects from their allegiance by Pope Sixtus, were more owing to *Peter's pence* than to *Peter's keys*. The noise of the thunder of the Vatican did not reach Sweden or Denmark, because the effluvia of their mines, and the filings of their gold were never carried by royal stipulations into the regions of the Italian atmosphere, to kindle into flames and cause an explo-

sion. But queen Elizabeth could not have pleaded a hundred years prescription against the court of Rome. 'Pope 'Paul IV. was surprised at her boldness, in assuming the 'crown, a fief of the Holy See, without his consent.'* Remark in the word *(fief)* a temporal claim, but no divine title.

If from Great Britain we pass into Germany, we can trace the rise and progress of the deposing power, in the grants of crowned heads, in pacts and stipulations, and in mutual favours and offices of friendship.

In the eighth century, when the citizens of Rome were harassed by the Lombards, and slighted by the Greeks, their lawful masters, Charlemagne marches to their assistance, defeats the Lombards, is crowned by Pope Leo III. and saluted Emperor by the senate and people of Rome. Nicephorus, who afterwards usurped the throne of Constantinople, sends Ambassadors to the new Emperor, and consents to the dismembering of an empire sinking under its own weight, and exposed to the first soldier of fortune who had the address to form a faction, and courage to plunge the dagger into the breast of the tyrant who filled the throne. What Leo III. has done, proves no right (if it proves any) but that of the law of nature, which authorizes a man, beset by his enemies, to call for assistance to the first who is willing to lend it, and in the effusions of gratitude to thank his deliverer. Bellarmin then has lost his labour in in writing a book, to prove that the Pope has transferred the Empire from the Greeks to the Germans, the better to give some colour to the 'baseless fabric' of the deposing power; for Leo III. did not deprive the Eastern princes of a foot of ground.

The Empress Irene, afterwards dethroned by Nicephorus, retained her dominions after the coronation of Charles, who acquired nothing by the title of Emperor, but a *sounding* compliment, All subsequent accessions were either by right of conquest, the tacit or express consent of the Greeks, or the choice of the Senate and Roman people, who preferred a powerful and useful stranger, to a weak and useless master.

The compliment, however, laid the foundation of a power

* Burnet.

strengthened by the Emperor's will, sent to Rome for the Pope's approbation, and raised to the highest altitude, by Charles the Bald's purchasing the Imperial Crown, for a sum of money, from Pope John the VIII. Hence fœderal transactions, promises confirmed by oath, pacts and stipulations between Popes and Emperors, who used to swear on St. Peter's tomb, and subscribe the conditions imposed on them. In the great struggles between the two powers, the Popes grounded their claims on customs and oaths, as may be seen in several passages of the canon law. 'Adstringere 'vinculo juramenti,' says Pope Clement V. 'prout tam nos 'observationis antiquæ temporibus novissimis renovatæ, quam 'forma juramenti hujusmodi sacris inserta canonibus mani-'festant.'* *Jus divinum*, divine right, or a plenitude of apostolic power, was out of the question.

In effect, Sir, before the tenth century, there have been as bad Kings, and good Popes as ever since. The cause of religion was equally interesting, and religion itself more violently persecuted. The Roman Pontiffs had the same spiritual authority, the promotion of piety and faith equally at heart, and in the great number some were influenced by different passions and views. For in this mortal life, we all retain some impressions of the frailty of our religion.

Yet neither piety, nor ambition, the propagation of faith, nor the reformation of morals, ever induced them to attempt the deposing of kings, or arrogating to themselves a power disclaimed by the Saviour of the world, convicted of falsehood by his apostles, and unheard of in the church for the space of ten ages. Why have some of the succeeding pontiffs deviated from the primitive path? I say *some*, because it would be unjust to charge them all alike. They are distinct individuals succeeding one another in the same throne, and one is as much to be blamed for the faults of his predecessor, as George III. is accountable for the licentiousness of Charles II.

Why have some of them deviated from the primitive path? It is that they had prescription and privilege to plead, oaths and treaties to support their claims. In the conduct of kings, choosing them for arbiters of their quarrels, covers

* Clementin. Roman. Princip! de jurej.

to their usurpations, and liege lords of their territories, they found a specious pretext to punish the infraction of treaties, and the breach of prerogative. A repetition of the same acts introduced custom, custom obtained the power of law, the law bound the parties concerned, and the violation of the law has been attended with penalties. Hence the deposition of an emperor was more owing to the code and pandects of Justinian, than to the Gospel of Christ. The Popes who stretched their prerogative beyond the bounds of moderation, were blamed by the Catholics themselves, whose religion was in no wise concerned in the quarrels of their superiors; and the few enthusiastic flatterers, who have attempted to lodge *Paul's sword* and *Peter's keys* in the same hand, and to make an universal monarch of the vicar of a crucified God, who acknowledged the power of a Heathen magistrate, have injured religion, and betrayed either their madness or ignorance. They have confounded fact with right, the unalterable dogmas of fate with the flux and changeable customs of men, and built a Chalcedon, though they had a Byzantium before their eyes.

They should have considered, that the church pleads antiquity, and that her criterion of truth, and test of sound doctrine, is that golden rule of Vincentius Lerinensis: 'Quod 'semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.' 'What has 'been held ever, and every where, and by all, ever.' The deposing power was never heard of, for the space of one thousand and eighty-seven years, from St. Peter to Gregory VII: a great chasm this! And the chain of tradition must be very short, when you take off a thousand and eighty-seven links.

The Apostles and their successors preached the Christian doctrine in all its rigour. They taught kings to cherish the cross in their hearts, before it was displayed in their banners, and to prefer a heavenly before an earthly throne. Had they thought (and who could know better?) that the power to depose them, and to absolve their subjects from their allegiance, were conducive to the glory of God and the honour of religion, they never would have concealed it, much less would they have commanded to obey them.

Every where and by all. The deposing power, though

grounded, as I remarked before, on temporal claims, has been opposed by the Catholics from its birth. In Germany, by open force and bloody wars: in Ireland, whose kings and prelates paid no attention to the famous bull of Pope Adrian; in England, by a solemn declaration, 16 Rich. II. Even under Elizabeth, a Protestant queen, the English Catholics joined their sovereign, and paid a greater regard to the command of St. Paul, *obey the prince*, than to the dispensation of Sixtus Quintus, or the expectation of being relieved by a Catholic king: which made the Spanish admiral say, 'that 'if he had landed, he would have made no distinction be- 'tween a Catholic and a Protestant, save what distinction the 'point of his sword would have made between their flesh.' I believe it; for a conqueror's sword is an undistinguishing weapon, were even a crucifix tied to the hilt of it. In invading England, it is the enemy of Spain, not the enemy of the mass, the Spaniards would attack; where they here this instant, they would not deprive a Protestant of his estate, because it belonged three hundred years ago to some old Milesian, whose posterity is now at the plough; it would not be their interest, the laws of conscience and conquest forbid it, and the rivals of England will always find their interest in the poverty and defenceless situation of her subjects.

In fine, the Pope's temporal power has been baffled by the Venetians in their contests with Paul V. And in France, whoever would argue in its favour would be confuted with a halter, or galley chain.

According to the canon law, a hundred years prescription in temporals can be pleaded against the Church of Rome.— 'Contra ecclesiam Romanam valet præscriptio centum anno- 'rum.' A hundred years and more have elapsed, since no Pope has attempted to dispose of kingdoms, or absolve subjects from their allegiance, though armies have been poured into the Pope's territories, and his cities taken by Catholic princes. Out of his own states, his temporal prerogative is confined to a palfrey he receives from the king of Naples every year, as a customary homage. The two late Popes have absolutely disclaimed any temporal power over kings. Thus, things have returned back into the former channel of

primitive simplicity: *God has his own, and Cæsar his due:* and the two powers which men had confounded, and blended into *one* Delphian sword, equally adapted to the ministry of the altar and profane uses, are again divided.

In tracing thus the temporal power, we have chosen a medium between the enthusiasm of some Italians, and the prejudices of their antagonists. The picture drawn by those different painters, is all light or shadow. In resolving it into the grants of kings and civil contracts, prescription and a colourable title, as its first principles, we prefer the middle tints: and in measuring the portrait by this rule, we give it its due dimensions.

But in binding the pontiff's hands, and denying him any power directly or indirectly in temporals, I solemnly declare that I do not mean to derogate in the least from his spiritual supremacy. A vindication of my character calls for this declaration: as two divines of my communion have censured the following passages of the seventh letter to Michael Servetus.

In mentioning the belief of Rome and Geneva, concerning the immortality of the soul, &c. I have made use of the expressions, 'their rule of faith is different: but these 'fundamentals of religion are entirely expunged from your 'ritual.' Here I was charged with admitting the famous distinction between fundamentals and non-fundamentals: but the truth of this charge I absolutely deny.

'Let the word, Church, be understood of the collective 'body of Christians,' &c. Here again I was represented as a Latitudinarian. But with submission to my censors, they mistook my meaning. To alledge the authority of the Church of Rome, against a writer who denies it, is to commit a gross fault against the rules of logic. It is a *petitio principii*, or begging the question. If ever they argue in this manner, when the dispute turns on articles believed by Christians of all denominations, I believe they would glorify God more by prayer and silence: for a bad argument is an injury to truth.

To some, this apology may seem unnecessary, but not so to me, whose character has been injured by the imputation of a double doctrine: I who am bound not to scandalize

a weak brother, and who, were I even the first pastor of the Church, should be as docile to her voice, as the least of her children.'

ART. VI.

'And, I do solemnly, in the presence of God, and of his 'only Son Jesus Christ our Redeemer, profess, testify, 'and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every 'part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the 'words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, 'or mental reservation, whatever; and without any dis- 'pensation already granted by the Pope, or any autho- 'rity of the See of Rome, or any person whatever; and 'without thinking I am or can be acquitted before God 'or man, or absolved of this declaration, or any part 'thereof, although the Pope or any other person or per- 'sons, or any authority whatsoever, shall dispense with, 'or annul the same, or declare that it was null and void 'from the beginning.'

This last paragraph excludes amphibologies, evasions, equivocations, and mental reservations eversive of natural candour and Christian sincerity,—branded by the pastors of the Church with the odious qualifications of 'rash, scan- 'dalous, pernicious, erroneous, opening the way to lies, 'frauds, perjury, and contrary to Scripture,' as may be seen in the catalogue of relaxed propositions condemned by Pope Innocent XI. and the clergy of France,* and detested by the very heathens:

'Ille mihi invisus pariter eum faucibus Orci,
'Cujus mens aliud condit quum lingua profatur.'

Upon these principles, the Catholics have taken the oath: and on these principles, it can be safely taken. It proposes nothing to their abhorrence and detestation, but what they really abhor and detest: it requires no promise but what is just and lawful.

But as the oath is complicate, and perplexed with a variety of phrases—as it minces even a syllable—and that the *letter*

* Propositio 27, inter condemnatas ab Innoc. XI.

seems to clash with the *spirit*—it is not surprising if many objections have been started against it.

Objections from the Hibernian Journal.

First: 'In swearing to support the succession of the 'crown in his Majesty's family, I bind myself to that which 'there is a possibility a loyal subject to the constitution 'might not have in his power to perform.'

Answer. You are not bound to impossibilities, neither does the oath require it, whereas it expresses, 'to the 'utmost of my power.'

Second: 'I am bound to take the oath *in the plain and 'ordinary sense of the words;* consequently, though untrained 'to arms, and unskilled in military discipline, I must run 'to the field of battle, in case of invasion or rebellion: 'otherwise I do not exert myself to the utmost of my power.'

Answer: You serve your king to 'the utmost of your 'power,' by remaining at home. You would only cause disorder: and an army in disorder flies to the slaughter-house, not to victory: 'Non ad victoriam, sed ad lanienam.'* The magistrate supports the king, 'to the utmost of his power,' in maintaining the public peace: the surgeon in dressing the soldier's wounds: the clergyman, in preaching loyalty and subordination, regularity and good morals, fraternal love and mutual benevolence. The king requires no more: and, as you write a great deal under the signature of 'An old 'Derryman,' all his majesty expects from one of your age 'is to *light the fire*, and to be hospitable, when his soldiers 'are quartered on you.'

Third: 'In swearing that I cannot be absolved of this alle-'giance, *by any authority whatsoever*, I deny the supremacy 'of the lords and commons.'

Answer. Your objection is grounded on error. The supreme power of the state is vested in the parliament, composed of king, lords, and commons.†

Fourth: 'What happened once may happen again. If 'the king attempts to overturn the constitution, I must help 'him, if I pay any regard to my oath, and thus betray my 'country: or perjure myself, if I refuse assistance.'

* Vegetius de re Militari. † Blackstone's Comment. B. 1. Ch. 2. p. 147.

Answer. Lest 'what hath happened once, may happen again,' say with the royal prophet, 'Domine salvum fac regem,' 'God save the king.' However, to allay your anxieties, remember that subjects do not swear to kings, as robbers or pirates swear to their leaders. You are not bound to help a king in his attempts against the laws of God and nature, when you have clear evidence that his attempts tend to the subversion of both; neither doth the test require, whereas, 'true allegiance,' is expressly mentioned. But in a doubt you are bound to obey, because in a doubt concerning the rectitude of their intentions, or the justice of their cause, presumption is in favour of your superiors.

What a kingdom! if all the inhabitants were astronomers, metaphysicians, and casuists, who would neither obey nor promise to be loyal to their sovereigns, until they would have read in the stars the fate of the constitution, and explored the remote regions of metaphysics, in search of the essential and demonstrative relations of unalterable truth to Magna Charta; Gulliver's floating island would be the fittest kingdom for such ærial inhabitants.

Further: If the remote and possible danger of the constitution's overthrow, or the subversion of the fundamental laws of any realm, were a sufficient objection against oaths of allegiance, either all the distinguished subjects of the world are perjured, or no king is entitled to their allegiance. For in swearing to their respective sovereigns, I do not believe that British peers, French nobles, or Spanish grandees, with all the delicacy of honour, Catholic or Protestant bishops, with all their divinity, use the following form of words: 'I will bear allegiance to your majesty, if you 'behave as an honest man, and do not overturn the consti-'tution.'

Before the royal head is encircled with the diadem, the monarch obtests the awful name of the Divinity, and swears that he will govern his subjects in 'justice and mercy.' They acknowledge their sovereign, and swear to be loyal. His future conduct, and the inconstancy of his will, are left to him who holds in his hands the hearts of kings, who, by the laws of England, 'can do no wrong.' The legislative power retains a right, and has the means of examining in what

manner the laws are executed or infringed, by bringing the king's counsellors to a strict account. 'But whatever may 'be the issue of this examination,' says Montesquieu, 'the 'king's person is sacred, the moment he is arraigned or 'tried, there is an end of liberty.'* The constitution then is equally in danger of being overturned by a refusal of allegiance, 'applicable not only to the regal office of the king, 'but to the natural person and blood royal.'†

Objections from the Hibernian Magazine.

First: 'No man can safely swear to a thing of which he 'is not certain. Now the test obliges the Catholics to de-'cide by oath, that they have positive and clear reasons not 'to believe that any foreign prince *ought* to have any civil 'pre-eminence within this realm. Now, what individual 'can pretend to so deep an insight into the much debated 'rights of princes, as to determine with certainty on so dif-'ficult and so abstruse a question; especially as the words '*ought* and *right*, extend to any kind of *right*, whether na-'tural, i. e. by right of blood, or acquired?'

Answer. The test obliges the Catholics to no such thing. All it requires is a negative belief, or a suspence of belief, concerning the rights of foreign princes, (*and I do declare that I do not believe.*) The paragraph is worded in a negative stile. But in a negative oath, ignorance of another man's right exculpates the person who swears, from perjury. A familiar example will set the matter in a clear light. Paul is in possession of a farm from time immemorial; this possession, and several other strong reasons incline me to believe, that he is the only rightful and lawful owner. Peter revives a dormant claim, which in my opinion is but a shadow. A magistrate interrogates me in this manner: *Do you believe that Peter ought to have a right to Paul's farm?* I answer, *I do declare, that I do not believe it.* In the name of goodness, whatever Peter's title may be, do I perjure myself in swearing to what is really my opinion?

* Spirit of Laws. vol. 1. p. 181.
† Blackstone's Comment. vol. 1. p. 371.

The word *right* is not mentioned in the oath, and in case it were, the objector's distinction, betwixt natural and acquired would give him no advantage; for with regard to civil pre-eminence and jurisdiction over free states, there is no *right* when the laws of nations are against it.

In France, the Salique law excludes females from inheriting the throne. Has the king's eldest daughter any right to it? In Portugal, where the crown is hereditary, the law disqualifies every stranger who lays claim to the throne by right of blood. Have foreign princes, though related to the royal family, any *right* to *civil pre-eminence* within that realm?

Second: 'The words, *ought to have*, seem to have a re-'trospect to the revolution, whereby James II. was 'deprived of the throne, because he was a Roman Ca-'tholic: for some members have affirmed, that no one 'could take this oath, but on revolution principles. If this 'be so, I swear what is equivalent to this—*The being a Roman 'Catholic is a just and reasonable disqualification for not enjoy-'ing hereditary right.* What Protestant in his senses 'would not think me perjured when I swear in this manner.'

Answer. Every Protestant, if such were the meaning of the oath; but neither the sense nor the letter of the oath is susceptible of such a forced construction. The framers of the test have blended together an oath of allegiance, and the old declaration against Popery, compiled by James I. In this declaration, the words ran thus: 'And I do declare, 'that I do not believe that the Pope of Rome, &c. hath or 'ought to have* any authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, 'within this realm.' By this declaratien translated into English, and still to be seen in the statutes, the Roman Catholics were obliged to renounce the Pope's spiritual supremacy, otherwise they had nothing to expect but halters and gibbets from our *beloved* Stuarts. The Senators of 1775, more humane than the royal pedant of 1603, have expunged in favour of distressed subjects, the words *ecclesiastical* and *spiritual*, and substituted *temporal* and *civil* in their place. Thus have they enabled the Catholics, to testify their loyalty

* Habet vel debet habere.

without swearing against their conscience. The words 'ought to have,' *have then no retrospect to James* II. who deprived himself of the throne, by quitting the realm, after having *abdicated* the constitution, by arrogating to himself a dispensing power.

Third: 'Marriage is founded on a *civil* contract, though 'of divine institution, and a sacrament in the belief of Catho-'lics. In denying the *Pope's civil power directly or indi-'rectly within this realm*, so far at least I deny the church's 'authority over a sacrament.'

Answer. A flat sophism! The Pope has no civil power direct or indirect in this realm, over any sacrament, but a spiritual power *ratione Sacramenti*, precisely as a sacrament, and so far it is a spiritual thing. In virtue of my ordination, I have power to consecrate bread and wine; have I any *civil power* over the baker's shop, or the vintner's cellar?

Fourth: 'I swear that I do not think that I can be ab-'solved of this declaration, or any part thereof, although any 'authority whatsoever shall dispense with or annul the same. 'Now, 'authority whatsoever' is of universal import. It in-'cludes the supreme authority of the state, the authority of 'God himself. Can a Catholic or Protestant swear that 'neither God, nor the state can absolve him of any part of this 'declaration, whereas God can deprive a tyrannical king of 'his throne, and the supreme authority of the state can ab-'solve a subject from his allegiance, and permit him to retire 'to whatever place he chooses, as a master can manumit a 'slave.'

Answer. By 'authority whatsoever,' is not meant the authority of God, nor the supreme authority of the state, but the authority of Rome, or foreign authority.

Fifth. 'The oath is to be taken in the *plain and ordinary 'sense of words*. *Authority whatsoever*, in the plain and or-'dinary sense of the words includes the authority of God 'and the state.'

Answer. The plain and ordinary sense of any word, is the sense annexed to it, by the common consent and custom of mankind, according to their respective idioms and languages: but in any legal act, mankind never extends the words 'authority whatsoever,' to the authority of God, who

is above the controul of human laws, nor to the supreme authority of the state, which is never presumed to bind its own hands, whereas it is an invariable maxim in human laws, that the same power which enacts them, can repeal and dispense with them. 'Per quascunque causes res nascitur, per eas-'dem solvitur.'

Sixth: 'The oath forbids *mental reservations* on pain of 'perjury. Now mental reservation is a proposition, which 'taken according to the natural import of the terms, is 'false; such is this proposition, *I declare that no authority 'whatsoever can dispense with any part of this oath;* ac-'cording to the natural import of the terms, it is false, be-'cause God and the state can dispense with a part of it: but 'if qualified by something concealed in the mind *(v. g. ex-'cept God or the state)* it becomes true. In that very pro-'position, there is a mental reservation, the great refuge of 'religious hypocrites, who accommodate their consciences 'with their interests.'

Answer. The definition is just, but proves nothing. For reservations were introduced in order to deceive the person to whom we swear. But the magistrates, in whose presence we take the oath, know that by *authority whatsoever*, is not meant the authority of God, nor that of the state.

Seventh: 'The last paragraph of the test, tends to con-'tradict an established doctrine of the Catholic Church, 'which is, that in the Church there is vested a power of ex-'amining into the nature of oaths, (which are acts of reli-'gion) and of determining whether they be, or be not law-'ful.'

Answer. The test does not deprive the Church of the power of examining into the lawfulness of oaths. The last paragraph is entirely levelled against the dispensing power: the right of examination is quite out of the question. *Without thinking that I can be acquitted of this declaration, &c.*

Eighth. 'A fundamental article of the Catholic faith, is 'the infallibility of the Church. This article is reversed by 'these words, *without thinking that I am or can be acquitted 'of any part of this declaration, although the Pope or any au-'thority whatsoever, shall declare that it was null and void 'from the beginning.* In fine, in taking the oath, a Catholic

'must reason in this manner. It is an article of my faith, 'that the church is infallible; the pillar of truth, says St. 'Paul, which the powers of hell can never overthrow, accord-'ing to the promise of Christ. Now should the church de-'clare, that this oath is null and void from the beginning, I 'bind myself by oath not to believe her. Is this consistent 'with the principles of a Catholic? To believe that the 'church is an infallible guide, and to bind himself by a so-'lemn oath not to believe her, although she should define 'contrary to his opinion!'

Answer. A Catholic should sooner expire on the wheel, than take an oath implying an abjuration of any point of his religion. We have not here a permanent city, and in suffering with uprightness and integrity for conscience' sake, we expect a better. We know that life is short, that the Christian is condemned to the cross, and that the pampered tyrant as well as the oppressed slave, must appear naked at the awful tribunal of Jesus Christ.

We are not to court the favours of government at the expense of conscience; neither does the oath impose such a rigorous condition.

The words, 'without thinking that I am or can be acquit-'ted of this declaration, although the Pope, or any authority 'whatsoever, shall declare that it was null and void from the 'beginning,' these words, I say, mean no more than that you are convinced of the truth of what you swear; and that, in case of a dispensation you think yourself still bound to keep your oath. For the words, 'acquitted, absolved,' regard the dispensing power. Now that the doctrines mentioned in the declaration, are not our real principles, has been sufficiently proved; and reason, as well as religion, informs us, that a dispensation granted against the law of God, or good morals, 'cannot acquit or absolve us before God and 'man.' 'It is not a faithful dispensation,' says St. Bernard, 'but a cruel dissipation.' 'Non fidelis dispensatio, sed 'crudelis dissipatio.'*

Ninth: 'Let us suppose that the church *shall declare the* 'oath null and void from the beginning, you bind yourself 'by oath not to believe her; and thus renounce your religion 'under cover of loyalty.'

* De Dispensatione et Præcepto.

Answer. I do not bind myself by oath not to believe the church in her doctrinal decision; I only swear that 'I do not 'think myself acquitted or absolved' of my obligations, by a dispensation granted by the Pope, &c. The last paragraph, as I remarked before, is entirely levelled against the dispensing power.

Our legislators know, that the infallibility of the church is a tenet of Roman Catholics. By the very preamble of the act, they enable us to give public assurances of our allegiance, without prejudice to our real principles. In swearing that 'I do not think myself acquitted of this 'declaration, although the Pope, or any authority what-'soever, shall declare that it was null and void from the be-'ginning,' I do not mean to deny the infallibility of the church, nor the authority of God, nor even the supreme authority of the state; and the magistrate, in whose presence I swear, knows that it is not my intention. As there is no design on one part, nor deception on the other, I neither renounce my faith, nor perjure myself, although the severity of the letter seems to import one, or the other, or both. Oaths and laws are liable to interpretations: and one general rule prevails over the world, viz. 'That a greater stress is to be 'laid on the sense, than on the words.' 'It is not to be 'doubted,' says the emperor Justinian, 'but that he acts con-'trary to the law, who, confining himself to the letter, acts 'contrary to the spirit, and intent of it: and whoever, to excuse 'himself, endeavours fraudulently to elude the true sense of a 'law, by rigorous attachment to the words of it, shall not 'escape its penalties by such prevarication.' 'Non dubium 'est in lege committere eum, qui verba legis amplexus, con-'tra legis nititur voluntatem: nec pœnas insertas legibus 'evitabit, qui se contra juris sententiam sæva prærogativa 'verborum fraudulenter excusat.'

'Whoever swears, must do it according to the intention 'of him to whom he swears, let the mode and form of the 'expressions be what they will,' says St. Isidorus. 'Qua-'cumque arte verborum quisque juret, Deus tamen, qui con-'scientiæ testis est, ita hoc accipit, sicut ille, cui juratur, in-'telligit.'* Far from renouncing the infallibility of the

* Isidorus apud Gratianum, 22. 9. 5. c. 9.

church, which is neither the purport of the oath, nor the design of a Catholic who takes it, I am convinced that the unerring spirit that guides her, will never permit her to define as an article of faith, any proposition rejected in the test, or sanctify any doctrine against the institution of Christ.

Faith is founded on revelation; and the church can never make a new article of faith. She can only declare what has been revealed, to prevent the chaff of human opinions from mixing with the pure grain of the Evangelical doctrine.

Supposing that faith is founded on revelation, and that, as the bishop of Meaux remarks, after Christ there is no new revelation, for in him is the plenitude—the Catholics rest secure that it is out of the church's power, to declare that their oath is null and void; as it is out of her power to declare that fraud, murder, and perjury are lawful. This shall appear by analyzing the oath.

First: 'Has God revealed that I am not to bear true allegiance to George III. or to renounce any allegiance to the 'Pretender? If he has revealed it, Pope Clement XIII. 'died an heretic: he banished an Irish superior for complimenting the Pretender with the title of *King of Great Britain.*'

Second: 'Has God revealed, that I can lawfully and 'piously murder my fellow-creature, and break a just promise, or refuse paying what I owe him, because he is of a 'different religion?'

Third: 'Has God revealed that I am *to believe* that Popes 'and foreign princes ought to have any civil authority within 'this realm?'

Fourth: 'Has God revealed, that kings can be deposed 'and murdered by their subjects, because they are excommunicated by the Pope and council?'

There is the whole substance of the oath: and as God has not revealed any of those assertions, but commanded the reverse, the church can never declare them as articles of faith. Did St. Paul mean to renounce the authority of Heaven, when he said, 'should an angel from Heaven preach 'another doctrine, do not believe him?' Does a Catholic renounce the authority of the church, in not thinking that

she can allow perjury? But if such be the case, you will ask me, 'why some people have written against this oath?' or, why 'the small number of Catholics have not united 'with the great number who have taken it?'

I can assure you, Sir, that the Catholics who have not taken the oath, look on the deposing power as a dream; the murder of heretics as an impious slander, calculated in times of turbulence, to *murder* the character of the innocent, and only adapted to those distant æras, when 'Papists attempted 'to blow up a river, with gun-powder, in order to drown a 'city.'* In fine, they are ready to swear allegiance to George the Third, and renounce any allegiance to the Stuarts.

But the chief exception to the oath is—the manner in which it is worded. It must be taken in 'the plain and or-'dinary sense of the words.' 'This cannot be reconciled 'with any authority whatsoever.' A Catholic *abjures* upon oath a doctrine he never believed. *Abjuration* implies the belief of a previous error. 'Foreign princes ought not to 'have,' &c. How can subjects know? or what is it to them? 'Without any dispensation already granted.' You suppose then that we have a dispensation to perjure ourselves; consequently it is nugatory to swear, when you are enabled not to believe us. It is too dangerous to sport with the awful name of the Divinity: and if a free-thinker reverenced the Supreme Being, his conscience would be screwed in taking an oath which minces a syllable, and requires a long commentary. Further: Every invader, every usurper, would avail himself of a similar oath. In Ireland, he would find it framed to his hand, and makes us swear 'that George the 'Third ought to have no authority within this realm,' though the lawful king would be at the same time asserting his right in England. The alternative would be; death or perjury.

Such are the exceptions of the few who have not taken the oath: exceptions not to be disregarded by those, with whom they may have any weight. For an oath is dreadful in itself: and we can never act against the dictates of an erroneous conscience, till our scruples are removed, 'Quod non est ex fide, peccatum est.'

* Walker, p. 349. Hume, Hist. of England, Vol. I.

Here below 'we see in a glass darkly,' says St. Paul. Providence has thrown a sable veil over the human intellect.—The scripture itself, this law of spirit and life, proposed as a rule to the learned and ignorant, is become the subject of disputes and controversies. All legal acts are liable to inconveniencies. It is impossible for the legislators who devise them, to read in the minds of other men, the doubts which may arise concerning the sense and force of some expressions. Hence, new acts to explain and amend former laws.

Should the wisdom of the legislative powers deign to reduce the oath to a few plain words, whereby we should swear allegiance to his Majesty; renounce any to the Stuarts; swear never to maintain nor abet any doctrine inconsistent with the rights of sovereigns, the security of our fellow-subjects, nor ever to accept of any dispensation to the contrary—all the ends of government would be fully answered, and the few scrupulous Catholics, who cavil about words, would join the great numbers who have proceeded upon more enlarged and liberal principles.

Should our neighbours doubt the delicacy of our consciences, when we swear, we have no argument to convince them, but the following:

We groan under the yoke of mysery and oppression, throughout the long and trying periods of six successive reigns. We suffer for crimes we have never committed. The punishment, which according to all laws should finish with the delinquent, is entailed on the innocent posterity to the fourth and fifth generation, by a rigorous severity, similar to that of those Tuscan princes, who used to fasten living men to dead bodies. The laws, which in other countries are the resource and protection of the errant pilgrim, are here the mortal enemies of the settled natives. These abortives of the Stuart race reign uncontrouled a long time after the death of their inauspicious progenitors. On every part they spread penal bitterness, with an unwearied hand; deal out transportation to the clergy; poverty and distress to the laity. They continually hang as so many swords, over our heads. The lenity of the magistrates, with the humanity of our Protestant neighbours, are the only clouds that intercept the scorching influence of those blazing comets, kindled in times of turbulence and confusion. Were it a principle of

our religion to pay no regard to the dictates of conscience—were our pastors and clergy such as they are described, 'people who dispense with every law of God and man, who 'sanctify rebellion and murder, and even change the very 'nature and essential differences of vice and virtue;'* were we people of this kind, the penal restraints would be soon removed. One verbal recantation of Popery, backed with a false oath, would dissolve our chains. In three weeks you would see all the Catholics at Church, and their clergy along with them. Licensed guilt would soon kick in wantonness, where starving innocence shivers without a covering. A remedy neglected from motives of conscience, is a proof of the patient's integrity. Our sufferings and perseverance plead aloud in favour of our abhorrence and detestation of perjury: and though our Protestant neighbours may laugh at the seeming errors of our minds, yet they will do justice to the integrity of our hearts.

Now, as in the primitive ages of the Church, it is our principle and duty to pray for our kings, 'that God would be 'pleased to grant them a long life and a quiet reign; that 'their family may be safe, and their forces valiant; their 'senate lawful, their people orderly and virtuous; that they 'may rule in peace, and have all the blessings they can de-'sire, either as men or princes.'†

I have the honour to remain,

Sir, your most humble,

And obedient Servant,

ARTHUR O'LEARY.

* Leland, b. 5. ch. 3. † Tertull. Apolog.

AN

ADDRESS

TO

THE COMMON PEOPLE

OF THE

ROMAN CATHOLIC RELIGION,

CONCERNING THE APPREHENDED FRENCH INVASION.

Brethren, Countrymen, and Fellow Citizens,

RELIGION has always considered war as one of the scourges of Heaven, and the source of numberless scourges and crimes. Men may arm their hands in defence of life and property; but their hearts shudder at the thoughts of a field of battle, which can scarce afford graves to the armies that dispute it, covered with the mangled bodies and scattered limbs of thousands of Christians, who never saw nor provoked each other before; and whose only fault was obedience to their princes! which obedience cannot be imputed to the soldier as a crime. The peaceful cottage deserted at the sight of an approaching enemy! Famine and distress closing the scene, and filling up the measure of calamities! Such are the misfortunes inseparable from war—misfortunes which induced the great St. Paul to exhort the Christians in the following manner: 'I exhort, therefore, that, first of all, 'supplications, prayers, intercessions be made for all men, 'for kings, and all that are in authority: that we may lead a 'quiet and peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty.'* And such should be the constant prayer of a Christian.

But what, my brethren, if the enemy's sword glittered in our streets, and that to the licentiousness of a foreign foe we added domestic dissensions! If the sound of the enemy's

* 1 Timothy, Chap II.

trumpet would be drowned in the cries and shrieks of the injured neighbour, whom we ourselves would be the first to oppress! Would not war itself lose its terrors, when compared to such outrages? And the calamities we would bring on ourselves, would not they surpass those which would pour in upon us from foreign nations? Such, nevertheless, are the fears that haunt us. Both Protestants and Catholics declare, that in case of an invasion, the common people are the greatest cause of their alarms; not from dread of your superior power; but from the sad necessity they would be under, of punishing those whom they are willing to protect, and the general confusion that would disturb the peace and tranquillity of the rich, and draw down inevitable destruction on the poor. For in such an unfortunate juncture, every Catholic possessed of a feather bed, and commodious habitation, would join his Protestant neighbour in their mutual defence. The aggregate body of them would not be a match for regular forces, yet they would be an overmatch for you. They would unite in one common cause; you would be divided amongst yourselves, exposed to each other's encroachments, and overpowered by all parties.

Such, my brethren, would be your situation, should you be unhappy enough to strike from the path of a peaceable and Christian conduct. Forbid it Heaven, that it should be ever your case! I conceive better hopes of you. Your unshaken loyalty under the most trying circumstances; the calm and quietness that reigned in your peaceful huts, scattered up and down the extensive counties of Cork and Kerry, where the Catholics are poor and numerous, whilst other parts of the kingdom were infested with *Houghers*, *White Boys*, *Hearts of Oak* and *Steel*, and alarmed at the continual sight of judges, chains and gibbets; the quiet and peaceable manner in which you behaved on a late occasion, when you imagined the enemy at your doors; all these circumstances are pledges of your loyalty and good conduct, and happy omens of your steady perseverance in the same line.

Your bishops and clergy have enforced the doctrine of peace, subordination, and loyalty, from the sacred altars, where the least lye would be a sacrilege, and crime of the

first magnitude. The Catholic gentlemen have set forth the example to you. Both have bound themselves to king and government, by the most sacred ties. They have souls to be saved, and would be sorry to lose them by wilful perjury: they who would be on a level with their Protestant neighbours, if they took but the qualification oath against the conviction of their consciences.

But the doctrine and example of the learned, prudent, and better sort of your profession, should be the only rule of your conduct; for in all countries, the generality of the common people are ill qualified to judge or determine for themselves. They are easily governed by the senses; hurried by their passions; and misled by a wild and extravagant fancy that intrudes itself into the province of Reason.

Far be it from me to suspect you for any design to avail yourselves of the calamities of your nation, or to commit, in time of war, a robbery which you would detest in time of peace. Is the crime less heinous, because it is committed against a neighbour, who is doubly miserable from the terrors of a foreign foe, and the outrageous assaults of a treacherous fellow subject?

When the soldiers asked St. John the Baptist, what they should do? He desired them, 'to do violence to no man; 'not to accuse any one falsely; and to be content with their 'wages.'* Hence all divines are agreed, that the empire of justice is so extensive, that war itself must acknowledge its authority. Kings, in declaring war, make a solemn appeal to the tribunal of heaven, for the justice of their cause. The soldier cannot, in conscience, plunder or oppress the merchant or husbandman in his enemy's country: he must strictly abide by the orders of his commander. If justice, then, in certain circumstances, must sheath the enemy's sword, how much more forcibly must it not restrain the citizen's hand from invading what he cannot enjoy without guilt here, and punishment hereafter? A punishment the more to be dreaded, as perhaps there would be no time for restitution and repentance! Indispensable obligations, to which every robber is liable, and without which he has no mercy to expect. But if a robbery committed on a private man, deserve death

* St. Luke, Chap. viii.

and damnation, what must not be the guilt of those who would flock to the enemy's standard, to the total overthrow and destruction of an entire kingdom? It would be vain to plead the hardships you suffer; the prospect of being reinstated in the lands of which your ancestors have been deprived in times of general confusion; a more free and unlimited exercise of your religion; in fine, the last argument of a desperate man, 'if they come, I have nothing to lose.' Those reasons I have not heard from yourselves: I have read them with surprise in speeches and essays against the repeal of the penal laws; and I hope in God, that your conduct shall for ever contradict them.

When an enemy lands in a country, every person has something to lose. The labourer who refreshes his weary limbs with balmy sleep, and for whose soft slumbers the gouty rich man would exchange his bed of down, would lose his rest from continual fears and apprehensions. When public works would be discontinued, and tradesmen dismissed by their employers, carpenters, masons, slaters, &c. would lose their hire. It would not be with a view to feed an hungry Irishman, that a number of French dragoons would make excursions from their camp: it would be with a design to carry off his calf or pig, and to kill himself if he resisted. Whatever distinction the laws of this unhappy kingdom may make between Protestant and Papist, a conqueror's sword makes none. War levels and confounds all religions, where their professors are subjects of a monarch whose kingdom is invaded.

When the French joined the Americans, it was not from love for the Presbyterian religion. If they landed here, it would not be with a design to promote the Catholic cause.—When Oliver Cromwell beheaded Charles the First, brother-in-law to the King of France, and issued a bloody decree, whereby all the English Catholics were commanded to quit the kingdom in the space of two months, the French, far from resenting the injury offered to the blood-royal and to the Catholic religion, sided Cromwell against Spain; and ordered the Duchess of Saxony to promote and protect her Protestant subjects, whilst the English Catholics were smart-

ing under the scourge of persecution, and threatened with total extermination.*

Thus all religions are alike to a political people, whose only aim is interest and conquest. Hence, in France, Protestants of all denominations are promoted in the army.—Protestant generals command her forces: the order of Military Merit is instituted for Protestant officers. It is equal to them whether a soldier prays or curses—whether he handles a bead or a prayer-book; provided he can manage a sword and gun. And if thirty thousand men, under the denomination of French troops, landed in Ireland, fifteen thousand Protestants, from France, Germany, Switzerland, &c. would make up half the number.

Neither are you to confide in their promises of protection. The history of their own nation informs us, that a French king banished his mother at the request of the English. The most part of yourselves can remember, that in the war of seventeen hundred and forty-five, they prevailed on the Pretender to invade Scotland. This adventurer, after suffering more hardships than any romantic hero we read of, no sooner returned from this chimerical expedition to Paris, than, at the solicitation of the English ambassador, he was forced to leave the kingdom of France. He died, about two months since, without issue; and by his death has rid the kingdom of all fears arising from the pretensions of a family that commenced our destruction, and completed our ruin.—Of this I think fit to inform you, as, in all likelihood, if the French landed here, some might give out that he might be in their camp, in order to deceive you by an imposture that would end in your destruction. For all those who would join the French, would be strung up after the war, and give occasion of charging the whole body of the Roman Catholics with the treachery of some of its rotten members. Or what protection could you expect from people who would sacrifice the ties of kindred and friendship for the good of their state?

Expect then nothing from the French on the score of religion, but remain peaceably in your cottages. Mind your

* Leti's Life of Cromwell.

business as usual, and be free from all groundless apprehensions. Work for those who employ you; for it is against the laws of war to molest or hurt any, but such as oppose the enemy, sword in hand: and the world must allow that the French are not strangers to the laws of war, or the rules of military discipline. The soldier himself, in the rage of slaughter, feels the impulse of humanity. He is bound to spare the supplicant who cries out for quarter, and to protect the town or city that surrenders for want of power to resist. Secure your lives, which run the risk of being lost by the sword in fighting for the foe, or by the rope if you chanced to escape the danger of the field: but above all, save your souls, which would be lost without resource: for among the crimes that exclude from the kingdom of heaven, St. Paul reckons *sedition:* and what greater sedition than to rise up against your king and country, and to defile your hands with the blood of your fellow-subjects?

Should the king and parliament adopt the policy of France, that rewards the soldier's value, and leaves his religion to God—should they enter on the liberal plan of the Protestant Powers of the continent, who level the fences, and make no distinction between religious parties—should the Catholic gentry, descended in a long line from warlike chieftains, and animated with the same courage and magnanimity that crowned with laurels their relations and namesakes on the banks of the Rhine, the walls of Cremona, in the fields of Germany, and the plains of Fontenoy, where hands disqualified from using a gun in defence of their native country, have conquered cities and provinces for foreign kings—should the Catholic gentry, I say, be empowered by parliament to join their Protestant neighbours, and press to the standard of their country, at the head of a spirited and active race of men, preserved by labour from the weakness of indolence, inured by habit to the rigours of manly exercise, and, like the Spartan youth, already half disciplined from the very nature of their sports and diversions—then join the banners of your country; fight in support of the common cause. If you die, you die with honour and a pure conscience: the death of a plunderer and rebel is infamy and reprobation.

I repeat it; you have nothing to expect from the French. Ireland they will never keep; or if they keep it, is it a reason that you should forfeit soul and conscience by plunder, treachery, and rebellion? St. Paul lays it down for a rule, that 'the damnation of those is just, who do evil that good 'may come.'* What must not be the damnation of those who do evil for the sake of mischief? And Christ declares, that 'it availeth a man nothing, if he gain the whole world 'and lose his soul.'

But by the coming of the French, your gain would fall short of your expectations, if any amongst you would be mad enough to entertain any expectations of the kind.—When the French take a Roman Catholic Captain, do they ever return him back to his ship or restore him his liberty, in compliment to his religion? Are we to expect more from them by land, than by sea? If then in compliment to the Catholic religion, they would not return a fishing boat to our distressed families, who would imagine they would give us all the estates in the kingdom? Or is it because these estates belonged in remote times to our ancestors, that we could in conscience dispossess the present owners, were it even in our power? The remains of old castles, formerly the seats of hospitality; and the territories which still bear our names; may remind us of our origin, and inspire us with spirited sentiments, to which the lower class of people in other countries are entire strangers, and which a wise government could improve to the advantage of the state. Yet these memorials of ancient grandeur and family importance, entitle us to no other pretensions than that of scorning to do any thing base, vile, or treacherous.

We must imitate that descendant of the Sidonian kings, who, from extreme poverty, worked in a garden: being asked by Alexander the Great, 'How he supported po-'verty?' 'Better,' replied he, 'than I could support gran-'deur. My hands supply my wants: and I want nothing, 'when I desire nothing.' Pity, my brethren, that this man was not a Christian! Or pity, that the Christians do not resemble this Heathen! The most flourishing empires have

* Romans, chap. iii.

fallen with time: the world is in a continual change: and the Roman Catholics must share the same fate with the rest of mankind.

There is no reviving old claims in this or any other country. Or perhaps, if we revived them, they could not stand the test of severe justice. Our ancestors have they ever encroached on their neighbours? On their first landing in this kingdom, have not they taken these estates from the Carthaginians, Firblogs, and others who were settled here before them? If then the Protestants, who are now in possession, gave them up, to whom would they give them? If they have no right to them, because they belonged to our ancestors—our ancestors had no right to them, because they belonged to others. If a French general sounded a trumpet, and desired us to take our lands, would there not be a thousand pretenders to every estate? Would not every one be eager for the best spot? And would not this spot fall to the share of the strongest, who would kill or overpower the weakest? I am ashamed, my brethren, at your reading such trifles in this paper. I should never have mentioned them, had not I read such a nonsensical charge in the writings of some paltry scribblers, who, in order to keep our Protestant neighbours in perpetual dread of inoffensive fellow-subjects, do not blush at an insult offered to common sense, and to the rights of mankind.

For, where property is once settled, secured by the laws of any realm, and confirmed by a long possession, there is no disturbing the proprietor. It is the general consent of nations, and the universal voice of mankind. By the Roman laws, thirty years possession secures the possessor in the enjoyment of his property. Even in Scripture we read, that, when a king of the Ammonites had challenged some lands which the Israelites had taken from his ancestors, Jephtah, the ruler of God's people, amongst other reasons, pleads a long possession: 'While Israel dwelt in Heshbon, why therefore did 'ye not recover them within that time?'* Thus from the first establishment of civil society, a long possession annihilates all claims. And by the same principles, every Protestant gentleman in Ireland has as good a right to his estate, as any

* Judges, chap. ii.

Milesian had before him. For this I appeal to your consciences: as you are to appear before God, if you cut corn in the field of a Protestant, or stole his hay, would not your confessor compel you to restitution? What right then should you have to the land where you would scruple to take the growth of it? Far then from giving you estates, the French could not, by the laws of war and the principles of conquest, universally agreed on by civilized nations, take a foot of ground from any person in the kingdom, for their own use; much less for yours. If the nation should be unable to make head against them, and that the chief men of the kingdom, and the representatives of the people, should prefer preservation to death, (as doubtless they will, if they have not superior forces to oppose them)—they neither will nor can require any more than the allegiance of the inhabitants, the same rates, taxes, and government support, that were granted to the king of England. The natives will be secured in the free exercise of their religion, the full enjoyment of their property, their laws and privileges. This is always done: the reverse would be an open violation of the laws of nations, which are binding on the very conquerors; and which, according to the present system, they strictly observe.

Thus, the common people are never interested in the change of government. They may change their masters: but they will not change their burden. The rich will be still rich. The poor will be poor. In France, they have poor of all trades and professions: it will be the same here. But you will tell me, 'that at least you will have the free exercise of your religion.' Pray, my brethren, do not your Protestant neighbours grant you the free exercise of your religion? Would they not esteem you more, in proportion as you would live up to its maxims? Even the worthy, learned, and charitable Dr. Mann, the Protestant Bishop, at the head of an assembly of his clergy, recommended benevolence and moderation towards the Roman Catholics. The same doctrine has been preached not long ago from the Protestant pulpit. Thus, it is the glory of our days, to see the unhappy spirit of persecution dying away, and christian charity succeeding the intemperate zeal and

unchristian superstition which, for many years, had disgraced religion, and dishonoured humanity.

Bells, steeples, and churches richly ornamented, contritribute to the outward pomp and solemnity of worship: but an upright heart and pure conscience are the temples in which the Divinity delights. We would fain worship God our own way. Doubtless. But are we to worship him against his will? In lighting up the sacred fire, are we to burn the house of God? Saul, king of Israel, intended to worship God, in offering up a sacrifice. The Lord rejected him, because he offered it up against the law. His intention was good; but the action criminal. Thus, the Lord would reject you, if, under pretence of a more free worship, you flocked to the standard of an enemy; rose up in rebellion against lawful authority; plundered your neighbour; and imbrued your hands in the blood of your fellow-subjects.

Let none then say, 'We will have a Catholic King.'—Subjects are little concerned in the religion of governors. Thousands of Catholics lose their souls in France and Italy, after leading a loose and dissolute life: thousands of them work their salvation in the Protestant States of Holland and Germany. It is then equal to man, what religion his neighbour or king be of, provided his own conscience be pure, and his life upright.

The Prussian, Dutch, and Hanoverian Catholics live under Protestant governments, and join their sovereigns against Catholic Powers. Their religion is the same with yours. And this religion enforces obedience to the king and magistrates under whom we live. Christ commanded tribute to be paid to an heathen prince, and acknowledged the temporal power of an heathen magistrate, who pronounced sentence of death against him.

Nero, sovereign of the world, rips open his mother's womb, and begins the first bloody persecution against the Christians; seventeen thousand of whom were slaughtered in one month; and their bodies, daubed over with pitch and tar, hung up to give light to the city. St. Paul, dreading that such horrid usage would force them to overturn the state, and join the enemies of the empire, writes to them in

the following manner: 'Let every man be subject to the 'higher powers; and they that resist receive unto themselves 'damnation.'* A strong conviction then that, in obeying our rulers, we obey God, (who leaves no virtue unrewarded, as he leaves no vice unpunished) sweetens the thoughts of subjection; and under the hardest master, obedience is no longer a hardship to the true Christian.

So great was the impression made by this doctrine on the minds of the primitive Christians—so great was their love for public order, that, although they filled the whole empire and all the armies, they never once flew out into any disorder. Under all the cruelties that the rage of persecutors could invent; amidst so many seditions and civil wars; amidst so many conspiracies against the persons of emperors, not a seditious Christian could be found.

We have the same motives to animate our conduct; the same incentive to piety, godliness, and honesty: the same expectations that raise us above all earthly things, and put us beyond the reach of mortality. 'For, here on earth,' says St. Paul, 'we have not a lasting city, but expect a 'better.'—Let not public calamities, bloody wars, the scourges of heaven, and the judgments of God, be incentives to vice, plunder, rebellion, and murder; but rather the occasions of the reformation of our morals, and spurs to repentance. Let religion, which by patience has triumphed over the Cæsars, and displayed the cross in the banners of kings, without sowing disorders in their realms, support itself without the accursed aid of insurrection and crimes. Far from expecting to enrich ourselves at the expence of justice, and under the fatal shelter of clouds of confusion and troubles, let us seriously reflect, that death will soon level the poor and rich in the dust of the grave: that we are all to appear naked before the awful tribunal of Jesus Christ, to account for our actions; and that it is by millions of times more preferable to partake of the happiness of Lazarus, who was conveyed to Abraham's bosom, after a life of holiness and poverty, than to be rich and wicked, and to share the fate of that happy man who, dressed in purple, and after a life of ease and opulence, was refused a

* Rom. Chap. xiii.

drop of water to allay his burning thirst. In expectation that you will comply with the instructions of your bishop and clergy, not only from dread of the laws, but moreover from the love and fear of God.

I remain, my dear brethren,

Your affectionate servant,

ARTHUR O'LEARY.

Cork, August 14, 1779.

THE

REV. JOHN WESLEY'S LETTER,

Containing the civil principles of Roman Catholics; also, a Defence of the Protestant Association.

TO THE PRINTER.

SIR,

SOME time ago, a pamphlet was sent me, entitled, 'An 'Appeal from the Protestant Association to the people of 'Great Britain.' A day or two since, a kind of answer to this was put into my hand, which pronounces, 'its style con- 'temptible, its reasoning futile, and its object malicious.'— On the contrary, I think the style of it is clear, easy, and natural; the reasoning, in general, strong and conclusive; the object, or design, kind and benevolent: and, in pursuance of the same kind and benevolent design, I shall endeavour to confirm the substance of that tract, by a few plain arguments.

With persecution I have nothing to do. I persecute no man for his religious principles. Let there be 'as boundless 'a freedom in religion,' as any man can conceive: but this does not touch the point. I will set religion, true or false, utterly out of the question: suppose the Bible if you please, to be a fable, and the Koran to be the word of God. I consider not, whether the Romish religion be true or false, I build nothing on one or the other supposition: therefore away with all your common-place declarations about intolerance and persecution for religion! Suppose every word of Pope Pius's creed to be true—suppose the Council of Trent to have been infallible—yet, I insist upon it, that no government, not Roman Catholic, ought to tolerate men of the Roman Catholic persuasion.

I prove this by a plain argument: let him answer it that can:—

That no Roman Catholic does or can give security for his allegiance or peaceable behaviour, I prove thus: it is a Roman Catholic maxim, established, not by private men, but by a public Council, that, 'no faith is to be kept with here-'tics.' This has been openly avowed by the Council of Constance, but it never was openly disclaimed. Whether private persons avow or disavow it, it is a fixed maxim of the church of Rome: but as long as it is so, nothing can be more plain, than that the members of that church can give no reasonable security to any government of their allegiance or peaceable behaviour; therefore, they ought not to be tolerated by any government, Protestant, Mahometan, or Pagan.

You may say, 'nay, but you will take an oath of allegi-'ance.' True, five hundred oaths; but the maxim, 'no 'faith is to be kept with heretics,' sweeps them all away, as a spider's web; so that still, no governors, that are not Roman Catholics, can have any security of their allegiance.

Again, those who acknowledge the spiritual power of the Pope, can give no security of their allegiance to any government; but all Roman Catholics acknowledge this; therefore they can give no security for their allegiance.

The power of granting pardons for all sins past, present, and to come, is, and has been, for many centuries, one branch of his spiritual power: but those who acknowledge him to have this spiritual power, can give no security for their allegiance; since they believe the Pope can pardon rebellions, high treasons, and all other sins whatsoever.

The power of dispensing with any promise, oath, or vow, is another branch of the spiritual power of the Pope; and all who acknowledge his spiritual power, must acknowledge this; but whoever acknowledges the dispensing power of the Pope, can give no security of his allegiance to any government.

Oaths and promises are none: they are light as air; a dispensation makes them all null and void.

Nay, not only the Pope, but even a priest, has power to pardon sins! this is an essential doctrine of the church of Rome. But they that acknowledge this, cannot possibly give any security for their allegiance to any government. Oaths are no security at all; for the priest can pardon both perjury and high treason.

Setting, then, religion aside, it is plain, that upon principles of reason, no government ought to tolerate men, who cannot give any security to that government for their allegiance and peaceable behaviour; but this no Romanist can do, not only while he holds, that 'no faith is to be kept with 'heretics,' but so long as he acknowledges either priestly absolution, or the spiritual power of the Pope.

'But the late act,' you say, 'does not either tolerate or 'encourage Roman Catholics.' I appeal to matter of fact. Do not the Romanists themselves understand it as a toleration? You know they do. And does it not already, let alone what it may do by-and-by, encourage them to preach openly, to build chapels, at Bath and elsewhere, to raise seminaries, and to make numerous converts, day by day, to their intolerant, persecuting principles? I can point out if need be, several of the persons: and they are increasing daily.

But 'nothing dangerous to English liberty is to be ap- 'prehended from them.' I am not certain of that. Some time since a Romish priest came to one I knew, and after talking with her largely, broke out, 'You are no heretic! 'You have the experience of a real Christian!' 'And 'would you,' she asked, 'burn me alive?' He said, 'God 'forbid! Unless it were for the good of the church.'

Now, what security could she have for her life, if it had depended on that man? The good of the church would have burst all the ties of truth, justice and mercy; especially, when seconded by the absolution of a priest, or, if need were, a papal pardon.

If any one please to answer this, and to set his name, I shall, probably reply: but the productions of anonymous writers I do not promise to take any notice of.

I am, Sir,

Your humble Servant,

JOHN WESLEY.

City Road,
Jan. 12, 1780.

A DEFENCE OF THE

PROTESTANT ASSOCIATION,

BY JOHN WESLEY.

VARIOUS pieces, under different signatures, having appeared in the public prints, casting unjust reflections on the Protestant Association, and tending to quiet the minds of the Protestants at the present alarming crisis, by insinuating that there is no danger arising from the toleration of Popery, and that such associations are necessary; I think it a piece of justice, which I owe to my countrymen, to give them a plain and true account of the views of this assembly, and lay before them the reasons which induced them to form this association, and determined them to continue.

Whether the gentlemen who have favoured the public with their remarks on this occasion, are really Protestants, or Protestant Dissenters, as they style themselves; or whether they are Papists in disguise, who assume the name of Protestants, that they may be able to undermine the Protestant cause with the greater success, is neither easy nor necessary to determine; but it is easy to see that they are either totally ignorant of the subject on which they write, or else they wilfully disguise it.

The pieces I refer to, are written with different degrees of temper. One gentleman in particular, appears to be very angry, and loads the association, and their friends, with the most illiberal and unmanly abuse. If this gentleman had clearly stated the cause of his resentment, he might have been answered; but as he appears to be angry at he knows not what, he can only be pitied. Others have written with more candour and moderation, and would have been worthy of regard, had they not been deficient in point of argument. If these are sincerely desirous of being informed, they are requested to attend to the following particulars:

However unconcerned the present generation may be, and

unapprehensive of danger from the great growth of Popery, how calmly soever they may behold the erection of Popish chapels, hear of Popish schools being opened, and see Popish books publicly advertised, they are to be informed that our ancestors, whose wisdom and firmness have transmitted to us those religious and civil liberties, which we now enjoy, had very different conceptions of this matter; and had they acted with that coldness, indifference, and stupidity, which seems to have seized the present age, we had now been sunk into the most abject state of misery and slavery, under an arbitrary prince and Popish government.

It was the opinion of our brave, wise, circumspect, and cautious ancestors, that an open toleration of the Popish religion, is inconsistent with the safety of a free people, and a Protestant government. It was thought by them, that every convert to Popery, was by principle an enemy to the constitution of this country; and as it was supposed that the Roman Catholic religion promoted rebellion against the state, there was a very severe law made to prevent the propagation of it. Such was the state of things in the reign of the great Elizabeth: and Popery having, notwithstanding such restriction, gained ground in the reign of James II. though the encouragement it then received from the state, was not equal to what it has now obtained, the nation was alarmed; and the noble and resolute stand which the Protestants then made against the advances of Popery, produced the Revolution.

In the reign of William the Third, the state was thought to be in danger from the encroachments of Rome; to prevent which, the act of Parliament was made, which is now, in the most material parts, repealed, and several Protestants being of opinion, that this repeal will, in its consequences, act as an open toleration of the Popish religion, they are filled with the most painful apprehensions: they think, that liberty, which they value more than their lives, and which they would piously transmit to their children, to be in danger: they are full of the most alarming fears, that chains are forging at the anvil of Rome for the rising generation: they fear, that the Papists are undermining our happy constitution; they see the purple power of Rome advancing, by hasty strides, to overspread this once happy nation: they shudder at the thought of darkness and ignorance, misery

and slavery, spreading their sable wings over this highly favoured isle: their souls are pained for their rights and liberties as men, and their hearts tremble for the ark of God.

Inspired with such sentiments, and under the influence of such reasonable and well-grounded fears, they think it a duty which they owe to themselves, their posterity, their religion, and their God, to unite as one man, and take every possible, loyal and constitutional measure, to stop the progress of that soul-deceiving and all-enslaving superstition which threatens to overspread this land. It is to be hoped, that an attempt, so just and reasonable, will be crowned with success; but should it fail through the supineness or groundless prejudices of those who ought to stand first in this cause, the members of this Association will enjoy the satisfaction of a self-approving mind, conscious of having done its duty; while those who meanly desert the Protestant cause, and tamely suffer the encroachments of Rome, may see their error when it is too late, and be filled with bitterness and remorse at a conduct so mean and despicable, and so unworthy their profession.

Whatever such persons may think of themselves and their conduct, and however they may dress themselves up in the splendid robes of candour and moderation, they are to be informed that their conduct is highly criminal, and may be attended with the most deplorable consequences; as, by their neglecting to appear on this great occasion, they give our rulers reason to conclude, that it is the sense of the nation that Popery should be tolerated.

It is sincerely to be lamented that Protestants in general are not more apprehensive of the danger. Have they forgot the reign of the bloody queen Mary? Have they forgot the fires in Smithfield, and can they behold the place without emotion where their fathers died? Will it ever be believed in future times, that persons of eminent and distinguished rank among the Protestants, and persons of high and exalted religious characters, refused to petition against Popery; and let it overspread our nation without opposition? Will it be believed that Englishmen were so far degenerated from the noble spirit of their ancestors, as tamely to bow the neck to the yoke of Rome? 'Tell not in Gath, publish it not in

'the streets of Askelon; lest the daughters of the Philistines 'rejoice; lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph.'

It is not to be wondered at that the Papists, either openly or in disguise, take every method to prevent the just and reasonable view of the Protestant Association, and therefore represent them as factious, seditious, and enemies to toleration. These charges, and every other which the malice of our enemies, or the groundless fears and prejudices of our mistaken friends shall hereafter exhibit, will be separately and distinctly considered in the course of these letters; and such an account given of the views of the Protestant Association, and the line of conduct which they have pursued, and intend to pursue, in order to accomplish the great end for which they associate, as will, I hope, obviate every objection, remove every scruple, and excite the Protestants to join hand in hand, and unite as one man, in that cause, in which their present and future welfare is so nearly concerned, by

JOHN WESLEY.

LETTER AND DEFENCE,

Addressed to the Conductors of the Free Press.

GENTLEMEN,

I KNOW that it is loss of time, and a loss to the public; impatient for a paper in which they have first discovered the outlines of their country's rights, and from whence they daily expect new illustrations, on the most important subjects—to take up *The Freeman's Journal* with idle controversy. Were controversy the subject, I should be the last to enter the list.

In your paper, which has already made its way to the Continent, on account of the late exertions of the Irish, and which should contain nothing unworthy of the nervous eloquence and liberal principles of your numerous and learned correspondents, Mr. Wesley, in a syllogistical method, and the jargon of the schools, has arraigned the Catholics all over the world, with their kings and subjects, their prelates and doctors, as liars, perjurers, patentees of guilt and perjury; authorized by their priests to violate the sacred rules of order and justice, and unworthy of being tolerated even by *Turks* and *Pagans*.* Such a charge carries with it its own confutation, but are there not prejudiced people still in the world? The nine skins of parchment, filled with the names of petitioners against the English Catholics, owe the variety of their signatures to pulpit declamations and inflammatory pamphlets, teeming with Mr. Wesley's false assertions. And, to the disgrace of the peerage, in this variety of signatures, is not the lord's hand-writing stretched near the scratch of the cobler's awl? For the parchment would be profaned, if the man who does not know how to write, made the sign of the cross.

I am a member of that communion which Mr. Wesley aspersed in so cruel a manner. I disclaimed upon oath, in

* See Mr. Wesley's letter, page 112.

the presence of Judge Henn, the creed which Mr. Wesley attributes to me. I have been the first to unravel the intricacies of that very oath of allegiance, proposed to the Roman Catholics; as it is worded in a manner which, at first sight, seems abstruse. And, far from believing it lawful to 'violate 'faith with heretics,' I solemnly swear without equivocation, or the danger of perjury, that in a Catholic country, where I was chaplain of war, I thought it a crime to engage the king of England's soldiers or sailors into the service of a Catholic monarch, against their Protestant sovereign. I resisted the solicitations, and ran the risk of incurring the displeasure of a minister of state, and losing my pension: and my conduct was approved by all the divines in a monastery to which I then belonged; who all unanimously declared, that, in conscience, I could not have behaved otherwise.

Mr. Wesley may consider me as a fictitious character; but, should he follow his precursor, (I mean his letter, wafted to us over the British channel), and, on his mission from Dublin to Bandon, make Cork his way—Doctor Berkely, parish-minister, near Middleton—Captains Stanner, French, and others, who were prisoners of war, in the same place, and at the same time—can fully satisfy him as to the reality of my existence, in the line already described; and that in the beard which I then wore, and which like that of Sir Thomas More, never committed any treason, I never concealed either poison or dagger to destroy my Protestant neighbour; though it was long enough to set all Scotland in a blaze, and to deprive Lord G..... G..... of his senses.

Should any of the Scotch missionaries attend Mr. Wesley into this kingdom, and bring with them any of the stumps of the fagots with which Henry the Eighth, his daughters, Mary and Elizabeth, and the learned James the First, roasted the heretics of their times, in Smithfield—or some of the fagots with which the Scotch Saints, of whose proceedings Mr. Wesley is become the apologist, have burnt the houses of their inoffensive Catholic neighbours; we will convert them to their proper use. In Ireland, the revolution of the great Platonic year is almost completed. Things are re-instated in their primitive order. And the fagot, which, without any

mission from Christ, preached the Gospel by orders of Catholic and Protestant kings, is confined to the kitchen. Thus, what formerly roasted the man at the stake, now helps to feed him; and nothing but the severity of winter, and the coldness of the climate in Scotland, could justify Mr. Wesley in urging the rabble to light it. This is a bad time to introduce it amongst us, when we begin to be formidable to our foes, and united amongst ourselves. And to the glory of Ireland, be it said, we never condemned but murderers and perpetrators of unnatural crimes to the fagot.

By a statute of Henry the Sixth, every Englishman of the Pale* was bound to shave his upper lip, or clip his whiskers, in order to distinguish himself from an Irishman. By this mark of distinction, it seems that what Campion calls in his old English, *glib*, and what we call the beard, as well as the complexion and size of both people, were much the same. In my opinion, it had tended more to their mutual interest, and the glory of that monarch's reign, not to go to the nicety of *splitting a hair*, but encourage the growth of their *fleeces*, and inspire them with such mutual love for each other, as to induce them to kiss one another's beards; as brothers salute each other at Constantinople, after a few days absence. I am likewise of opinion, that Mr. Wesley, who prefaces his letter with 'the interest of the Protestant religion,' would reflect more honour on his ministry, in promoting the happiness of the people, by preaching love and union, than in widening the breach, and increasing their calamities by division. The English and Irish were, at that time, of the same religion; but, divided in their affections, were miserable.—Though divided in speculative opinions, if united in sentiment, we would be happy. The English settlers breathed the vital air in England, before they inhaled the soft breezes of our temperate climate. The present generation can say, 'our fathers and grandfathers have been born, bred, and 'buried here. We are Irishmen, as the descendants of 'the Normans, who have been born in England, are 'Englishmen.'

* See the statutes of that king; and lament the effects of divisions fomented by sovereigns.

Thus, born in an island in which the ancients might have placed their Hesperian gardens and golden apples, the temperature of the climate, and quality of the soil inimical to poisonous insects, have cleansed our veins from the sour and acid blood of the Scythians and Saxons. We begin to open our eyes and to learn wisdom from the experience of ages.—We are tender-hearted: we are good-natured: we have feelings. We shed tears on the urns of the dead; deplore the loss of hecatombs of victims slaughtered on the gloomy altars of religious bigotry; cry in seeing the ruins of cities over which fanaticism has displayed the funeral torch; and sincerely pity the blind zeal of our Scotch and English neighbours, whose constant character is to pity none, for erecting the banners of persecution, at a time when the inquisition is abolished in Spain and Milan, and the Protestant gentry are caressed at Rome, and live unmolested in the luxuriant plains of France and Italy.

The statute of Henry the Sixth is now grown obsolete.—The razor of calamity has shaved our lower and upper lips, and given us smooth faces. Our land is uncultivated; our country a desart; our natives are forced into the service of foreign kings, storming towns, and in the very heat of slaughter, tempering Irish courage with Irish mercy.* All our misfortunes flow from long-reigning intolerance, and the storms which, gathering first in the Scotch and English atmosphere, never failed to burst over our heads.

We are too wise to quarrel about religion. The Roman Catholics sing their spalms in Latin, with a few inflections of the voice. Our Protestant neighbours sing the same psalms in English, on a larger scale of musical notes. We never quarrel with our honest and worthy neighbours, the Quakers, for not singing at all; nor shall we ever quarrel with Mr. Wesley for raising his voice to heaven, and warbling forth his canticles on whatever tune he pleases; whether it be the tune of *guardian angels* or *langolee*. We like social harmony; and, in civil music, hate discordance. Thus, when we go

* Count Dillon and the Irish brigade could not be prevailed on by D'Estaing to put the English garrison to the sword. 'We will not kill our countrymen,' said they; 'would it not be wiser to let these gallant men go to mass, and serve their own king?

to the shambles, we never enquire into the butcher's religion; but into the quality of his meat. We care not whether the ox was fed in the Pope's territories, or on the mountains of Scotland, provided the joint be good; for, though there be many heresies in old books, we discover neither heresy nor superstition in beef and claret. We divide them cheerfully with one another; and, though of different religions, we sit over the bowl with as much cordiality as if we were at a love-feast.

The Protestant associations of Scotland and England may pity us; but we feel more comfort than if we were scorching one another with fire and fagot. Instead of singing 'peace 'to men of good will on earth,' does Mr. Wesley intend to sound the fury of Alecto's horn, or the war-shell of the Mexicans? The Irish, who have no resource but in their union, does he mean to arm them against each other? One massacre, to which the fanaticism of the Scotch and English regicides give rise, is more than enough: Mr. Wesley should not sow the seeds of a second. When he felt the first-fruits and illapses of the spirit—when his zeal, too extensive to be confined within the majestic temples of the church of England, or the edifying meeting-houses of the other Christians, prompted him to travel most parts of Europe and America, and to establish a religion and houses of worship of his own, what opposition has he not met with from the civil magistrates! with what insults from the rabble! broken benches, dead cats, and pools of water bear witness. Was he then the trumpeter of persecution? Was his pulpit changed into Hudibras's 'drum ecclesiastic?' Did he abet banishment and proscription on the score of conscience? Now that his tabernacle is established in peace, after the clouds having borne testimony to his mission,* he complains in his second letter, wherein he promises to continue the fire which he has already kindled in England, that people of exalted ranks in church and state, have refused entering into a mean confederacy against the laws of nature, and the rights of mankind. In his first letter, he disclaims persecution on the score of religion;

* See an abridgment of Wesley's journal, wherein he says, that in preaching one day at Kinsale, a cloud pitched over him.

and, in the same breath, strikes out a creed of his own for the Roman Catholics; and says, that 'they should not be 'tolerated even amongst the Turks.' Thus, the satyr in the fable breathes hot and cold in the same blast; and a lamb of peace is turned inquisitor! 'But is not that creed men-mentioned 'by Mr. Wesley, the creed of the Roman Catholics?' By right it should be theirs: as it is so often bestowed on them, and that, according to the civil law, a free gift becomes the property of the person to whom it is bestowed, if there be no legal disqualification on either side. But the misfortune is, that the Catholics and the framers of the fictitious creed, so often refuted, and still forced on them, resemble the Frenchman and the blunderer in the comedy: one forces into the other's mouth a food which he cannot relish, and against which his stomach revolts.

Mr. Wesley places in the front of his lines, the general Council of Constance; places the Pope in the centre: and brings up the rere of his squadrons with a confabulation between a priest and a woman; whilst his letters are skirmishing on the wings. Let us march from the rere to the front: for religious warriors seldom observe order.

A priest then said to a woman whom Mr. Wesley *knows*, 'I see you are no heretic: you have the experience of a 'real Christian.' 'And would you burn me?' said she, 'God forbid,' replied the priest, 'except for the good of 'the church.' Now this priest must be descended from some of those who attempted to blow up a river with gunpowder, in order to drown a city.* Or he must have taken her for a witch; whereas, by his own confession, 'she was no heretic.' A gentleman whom *I know*, declared to me, upon his honour, that he heard Mr. Wesley repeat, in a sermon preached by him in the city of Cork, the following words: 'A little bird cried out in Hebrew—O Eternity! 'Eternity! who can tell the length of Eternity?' I am then of opinion, that a *little Hebrew bird* gave Mr. Wesley the important information about the priest and the woman. One story is as interesting as the other: and both are equally alarming to the Protestant interest. Hitherto it is a drawn battle between us: from the rere, then, let us advance to

* Among other plots attributed to the Roman Catholics in the reign of Charles the First, this extraordinary one was thrown upon them. See Hume.

the van, and try if the general Council of Constance, which Mr. Wesley places at the head of his legions, be impenetrable to the sword of truth.

After reading the ecclesiastical history concerning that council, and Doctor Hay's answer to Archibald Drummond, I have gone through the drudgery of examining it all over in St. Patrick's library, when Mr. Wesley's letters made their appearance. The result of my researches is, a conviction, that there is no such doctrine as 'violation of faith 'with heretics,' authorized by that Council. Pope Martin V. whom the fathers of that Council elected, published a bull, wherein he declares that 'it is not lawful for a man to 'perjure himself. on any account; even for the faith.' Subsequent pontiffs have lopped off the excrescence of relaxed casuistry.

The Pope's *horns*, then, are not so dangerous, as to induce Mr. Wesley to sing the Lamentations of Jeremiah the Prophet, deploring the loss of Jerusalem: or to send us from London an Hebrew elegy, to be modulated on the key of the Irish *Ologone*. 'Their souls are pained, and 'their hearts trembling for the ark of God.* Tell it not in 'Gath; publish it not in the streets of Askelon: lest the 'daughters of the Philistines rejoice: lest the daughters of 'the uncircumcised triumph.'

This same elegy resounded through Great Britain a little before the ark of England was destroyed, the sceptre wrested out of the hands of her king, her pontiffs deprived of their mitres, and her noblemen banished from the Senate. Thus, as the Delphian sword slaughtered the victim in honour of the Gods, and dispatched the criminal on whom the sentence of the law was passed; the scripture is made subservient to profane, as well as sacred purposes. It recommends and enforces subordination; and, at the same time, becomes an arsenal from whence faction takes its arms. Like Boileau's heroes, in the Battle of the Books, we ransack old councils; we disturb the bones of old divines, who, wrapped up in their parchment blankets, sleep at their ease on the shelves of libraries, where they would snore for ever, if the noise of the gunpowder, upon an anniversary day, or the restless hands of pamphlet-writers, industrious in inflaming the rabble, did

* Defence of the Protestant Association, p. 116.

not rouse them from their slumbers. Peace to their manes! The charity sermon preached in Dublin, by Doctor Campbell—the anniversary sermon preached in Cork, last November, by Doctor la Malliere—and the discourse to the Echlinville volunteers, by Mr. Dickson—have done more good in one day, either by procuring relief for the distressed, or by promoting benevolence, peace, and harmony amongst fellow-subjects of all denominations, than the folios written on Pope Joan have done in the space of two hundred years.

I must now sound the retreat, with a design to return to the charge, and to attack Mr. Wesley's first battery, on which he has mounted the canons of the Council of Constance. If I cannot succeed (from want of abilities, but not from want of the armour of truth,) I am sure of making a retreat, in which it is impossible to cut me off. For, in the very supposition that the Council of Constance, and all the councils of the world, had defined 'violation of faith with 'heretics,' as an article of faith, and that I do not believe it; 'violation,' then, 'of faith with heretics,' is no article of my belief. For, to form one's belief, it is not sufficient to read a proposition in a book: interior conviction must captivate the mind. The Arian reads the divinity of Christ in the New Testament, and still denies it. Would Mr. Wesley assert that the divinity of Christ is an article of the Arian faith? If, then, 'violation of faith with heretics,' be the *tessera fidei*, the badge of the Roman Catholic religion, the Roman Catholics are all Protestants, and as well entitled to sing their psalms, as Mr. Wesley his canticles. I would not be one hour a member of any religion that would profess such a creed as Mr. Wesley has sent us from London.

You may, perhaps, be surprised, Gentlemen, that the introduction to a serious subject should savour so little of the gloom and sullenness so familiar to polemical writers; or that the ludicrous and serious should be so closely interwoven with each other.—

But remark a set of men who tax the nobility, gentry, and head clergy of England with degeneracy, for not degrading the dignity of their ranks and professions. Remark them exposing their parchments in meeting-houses and

vestries, begging the signatures of every peasant and mendicant, who comes to hear the gospel: 'Wrong no man; 'he that loves his neighbour fulfils the law,' &c. and those pious souls 'pained and trembling for the ark of God,' running with the faggot to kindle the flames of sedition, and to oppress their neighbours. Remark, in seventeen hundred and eighty, a lord with his hair cropped, a bible in his hand, turned elder and high-priest at the age of *twenty- three*, and fainting for the *Ark of Israel.*

In the fore-ground of this extraordinary picture, remark a *Missionary*, who has reformed the very reformation; separated from all the Protestant churches, and in trimming the vessel of religion, which he has brought into a new dock, has suffered as much for the sake of conscience, as Lodowick Muggleton or James Nailer could register in their martyrology. Remark that same gentleman inflaming the rabble, dividing his Majesty's subjects, propagating black slander, and throwing the gauntlet to people who never provoked him. Is not fanaticism, the mother of cruelty, and the daughter of folly, the first character in this religious masquerade? Is it not the first spring that gives motion to these extraordinary figures, so corresponsive to Hogarth's Enraged Musician? And in fencing with folly, have not the gravest authors handled the foils of ridicule? To the modern Footes and Molieres, or to the young student in rhetoric, who employs irony in enlarging on his theme, should I for ever leave the 'pained souls and trembling hearts,' of the Scotch Jonathan and the English Samuel, with their squadrons of Israelites fighting 'for the ark of the Lord,' if what they style in England the Gordonian Associations, had not voted their thanks to Mr. Wesley, for what they call his *excellent letter.* Such a performance is worthy the approbation of such censors: and in their holy shrines the sacred relic should be reposited. In examining a performance which contains in a small compass, all the horrors invented by blind and misguided zeal, set forth in the most bitter language, I shall confine myself to the strict line of an apologist, who clears himself and his principles from the foulest aspersions. To the public and their impartial reason, the appeal shall be made: to the sentiments implanted in the human breast, and to the conduct of man, not to the

rubbish of the schools, Mr. Wesley should have made application, when he undertook to solve the interesting problem, whether the Roman Catholics should be tolerated, or persecuted? But inspired writers partake of the spirit of the *seers*, and copy as much as possible after the prophets; the prophet Ezekiel breathed on a pile of bones, and lo! a formidable army starting from the earth and ranging itself in battle array. Mr. Wesley blows the dust of an old book, and lo! squadrons of religious warriors engaged in a crusade for the extirpation of the infidels.

The loyalty, the conduct, the virtues common to all, the natural attachment of man to his interest and country, the peaceable behaviour of the Roman Catholics, have no weight in the scale of candour and justice. An old Council, held four hundred years ago, is ransacked and misconstrued; a Roman Catholic is unworthy of being tolerated amongst the Turks, because Mr. Wesley puts on his spectacles to read old Latin.

I have the honour to remain,

Gentlemen,

Your humble, and obedient Servant,

ARTHUR O'LEARY.

Mary's-Lane, Dublin,
February 28, 1780.

LETTER II.

(Addressed as the Former.)

GENTLEMEN,

FANATICISM is a kind of religious folly. We laughed at it in a former letter. Whoever has a mind to indulge his humour at our expence, is heartily welcome. You now expect a serious answer to a serious charge. I send you such as occurs.

'The Council of Constance has openly avowed violation 'of faith with heretics: but it has never been disclaimed.— 'Therefore,' concludes Mr. Wesley, 'the Roman Catholics 'should not be tolerated amongst the Turks or Pa-'gans.'

A Council so often quoted in anniversary sermons, parliamentary debates, and flying pamphlets, challenges peculiar attention. We shall examine it with as much precision as possible, and with the more impartiality, as strict justice shall be done to all parties. Mr. Wesley knows that we are all Adam's children, who feel the fatal impressions of our origin, and that ambition which took its rise in heaven itself, often lurks in a corner of the sanctuary where the ministers of religion offer up their prayers, as well as in the cabinets of kings, where shrewd courtiers form their intrigues. At a

time, then, when ambition, that insatiable desire of elevation, that worm which stings the heart, and never leaves it at rest, presented the universe with the extraordinary sight of three prelates reviving the restless spirit of the Roman triumvirate, and disturbing the peace of mankind as much with their spiritual weapons, as Octavius, Athony, and Lepidus had disturbed it with their armed legions—at a time when the broachers of new doctrines were kindling up the fire of sedition, and after shaking the foundations of what was then the established religion, were shaking the foundations of thrones and empires—at that critical time, in 1414, was held the Council of Constance, with a design, as the fathers of that Council express themselves, to reform the church in her head and members; and put an end to the calamities which the restless pride of three bishops, assuming the titles of Popes by the names of Gregory the Twelfth, Benedict the Thirteenth, and John the Twenty-third, had brought on Europe, split into three grand factions by the ambition of the above-mentioned competitors. Such transactions in the ministers of a religion that preaches up peace and humility, as the solid foundations on which the structure of all Christian virtues is to be raised, may startle the unthinking reader, and give him an unfavourable idea of religion: but we are never to confound the weakness of the minister with the holiness of his ministry. We respect the sanctuary in which Stephen officiated—though Nicholas profaned it: we revere the place from whence Judas fell—and to which Matthias was promoted: the scriptures respect the chair of Moses—though they censure several pontiffs who sat in it; and no Catholic canonizes the vices of Popes—though he respects their station and dignity. The pontifical throne is still the same, whether it be filled with a cruel Alexander the Sixth, or a benevolent Ganganelli.

To the Council of Constance was cited then John Huss, a Bohemian, famous for propagating errors tending to tear the mitre from the heads of bishops, and wrest the sceptre from the hands of kings: in a word, he was obnoxious to Church and State; and if Mr. Wesley and I preached up his doctrine *in the name of God*, we would be condemned *in the name of the King*. The Protestant and Catholic divines would banish us from their universities; and the judges of

assize would exterminate us from civil society. Such a Doctor had no indulgence to expect from a Council, which, after deposing two rivals for the Popedom, condemned a third for contumacy, and elected another in his room.

But in mentioning John Huss, whose trial and execution at Constance have given rise to the foul charge of *violation of faith with heretics*, let none imagine that I am an apologist for the fiery execution of persons, on the score of religious opinions. Let the legislators who were the first to invent the cruel method of punishing the errors of the mind with the excruciating tortures of the body, and anticipating the rigour of eternal justice, answer for their own laws. I am of opinion that the true religion, propagated by the effusion of the blood of its martyrs, would still triumph without burning the flesh of heretics; and that the Protestant* and Catholic legislators who have substituted the blazing pile in the room of Phalaris's brazen bull, might have pointed out a more lenient punishment for victims, who, in their opinion, had no prospect during the interminable space of a boundless eternity, but that of *passing from one fire into another*. If in enacting such laws they had consulted the true spirit of religion, I believe the reformation of their own hearts would have been a more acceptable sacrifice to the Divinity, than hecatombs of human victims. 'No God nor man,' says Tertullian, 'should be pleased with a forced service.' 'We are 'not to persecute those whom God tolerates,' says St. Augustine. That faith is fictitious which is inspired by the edge of the sword.

But still the nature of society is such, that when once the common land-marks are set up, it opposes the hand of the individual that attempts to remove them. Where one common mode of worship is established, and fenced by the laws of the state, whoever attempts to overthrow it, must expect to meet with opposition and violence, until custom softens the rigour of early prejudices, and reconciles us to men whose features and lineaments are like our own, but still seem strange to us, because their thoughts are different.

* The imperial laws which condemned heretics to the flames, have been put into execution by Calvin, Queen Elizabeth, James the First, &c.

How far opposition to religious innovations is justifiable, is not our business to discuss. But the experience of ages evinces the fact; and in dissimilar circumstances, Mr. Wesley has made the trial. In kingdoms, where, as in the Roman Pantheon, every divinity had its altars, speculative deviations from the religion established by law, the singularity of love-feasts and nocturnal meetings, so unusual among the modern Christians of every denomination, roused the vigilance of the magistrate, and influenced the rage of the rabble. Now, that custom has rendered Mr. Wesley's meeting-houses and mode of worship familiar, and that all denominations enjoy a share of that religious liberty, whereof he would fain deprive his Roman Catholic neighbour, his matin hymns give no uneasiness either to the magistrate, or his neighbours. But had Mr. Wesley raised his notes on the high key of civil discordance—had he attempted by his sermons, his writings and exhortations, to deprive the Bishops of the established religion, of their croziers; kings of their thrones; and magistrates of the sword of justice; long ere now would his pious labours have been crowned with martyrdom, and his name registered in the calendar of Fox's Saints. Such, unfortunately, was the case of John Huss. Not satisfied with overthrowing what was then the established religion, and levelling the fences of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, he strikes at the root of all temporal power, and civil authority. He boldly asserts that 'princes, magistrates, &c. in 'the state of mortal sin, are deprived *ipso facto* of all power 'and jurisdiction.'* In this doctrine was enveloped the seeds of anarchy and sedition, which subsequent preachers unfolded to the destruction of peace and tranquillity, almost all over Europe; and which Sir William Blackstone describes as follows: 'The dreadful effects of such a religious 'bigotry, when actuated by erroneous principles, even of 'the Protestant kind, are sufficiently evident from the his-'tory of the Anabaptists† in Germany, the Covenanters in

* See the acts of the Council of Constance in L'Abbe's collection of Councils.

† This is no imputation on the Anabaptists of our days, who are as peaceable and good men as any others. Men's opinions change with the times, as in different stages of life we change our thoughts, and settle at the age of forty the roving imagination of sixteen. Custom and mutual intercourse amongst fellow-subjects of every denomination, would soon quench the remaining sparks of religious feuds, if distinctive laws were abolished. But, unfortunately for the society in which we live, the laws, whose aim should be to unite the inhabitants, are calculated to divide them. My neighbour

'Scotland, and the deluge of sectaries in England, who 'murdered their sovereign, overturned the church and mo-'narchy, shook every pillar of law, justice, and private pro-'perty, and most devoutly established a kingdom of saints 'in their stead.'*

John Huss, then, after broaching the above mentioned doctrines, and making Bohemia the theatre of intestine war, is summoned to appear before the Council. He obtains a safe conduct from the Emperor Sigismund, commanding governors of provinces, &c. not to molest him on his journey to, or return from Constance; but to afford him every aid and assistance. In all the provinces and cities through which he passes, he gives public notice of his intention to appear before the Council and stand his trial. But instead of standing his trial, and retracting his errors, he attempts to make his escape, in order to disseminate, and make them take deeper root. He is arrested and confined, in order that he should take his trial, after having violated his promise, and abused a safe conduct granted him for the purpose of exculpating himself, or retracting his errors, if proved against him before his competent judges. It is here to be remarked, that John Huss was an ecclesiastic; and that in spiritual cases the bishops were his only and competent judges. The boundaries of the two powers, I mean the church and state, being kept distinct; the censer left to the pontiff, and the sword to the magistrate; the church confined to her spiritual weapons; privation of life and limb, and corporeal punishments being quite of the province of the state; one should not interfere with the other. As the body of the criminal is under the controul of the magistrate, too jealous of his privilege to permit the church to interfere with his power—so, erroneous

distrusts me, because the penal laws held me forth as a reprobate before I was born, and during my life encourage him to seize my horse, or drag me before a magistrate for saying my prayers, which reduces me to the sad necessity of hating him, or considering him as an enemy, if in the great struggle between nature and grace, religion does not triumph. Before Lewis the Fourteenth and George the First, repealed the laws against witches, every disfigured old woman was in danger of her life, and considered as a sorceress Since the witch-making laws have been repealed, there is not a witch in the land, and the dairy-maid is not under the necessity of using counter-charms to hinder the milk from being enchanted from her pail Thus, if the penal laws, which by a kind of omnipotence create an original sin, making rogues of Catholics before they reach their hands to the tempting fruit, were once repealed, they would be as honest as their neighbours, and the objects of their love and confidence.

* Blackstone's Commentaries, vol. IV. chap. 8.

doctrines are under the controul of spiritual judges, too jealous of their prerogatives, to permit the civil magistrate to interfere with their rights. Hence, when the partizans of Huss raised clamours about his confinement, and pleaded his safe-conduct, the Council published the famous decree which has given rise to so many cavils, for the space of four hundred years, though thousands of laws of a more important nature, and of which we now think but little, have been published since that time. The Council declares, 'that every 'safe conduct granted by the Emperor, Kings, and other 'temporal princes, to heretics, or persons accused of heresy, 'ought not to be of any prejudice to the Catholic faith, or to 'the ecclesiastical jurisdiction; nor to hinder that such per-'sons may and ought to be examined, judged, and punished, 'according as justice shall require, if those heretics refuse to 'revoke their errors: and the person who shall have pro-'mised them security, shall not, in this case, be obliged to 'keep his promise, by whatever tie he may be engaged, be-'cause he has done all that is in his power to do.' I appeal to the impartial public, whether that declaration of the Council does not regard the peculiar case of safe-conducts, granted by temporal princes, to perons who are liable to be tried by competent and independent tribunals? And, whether it be not an insult to candour and common sense, to give it such a latitude as to extend it to every lawful promise, contract, or engagement between man and man? As if the Council of Constance meant to authorize me to buy my neighbour's goods, and after a solemn promise to pay him, still to keep his substance, and break my word. The church and state are two distinct and independent powers, each in its peculiar line. A man is to be tried by the church for erroneous doctrines: a temporal prince grants this man a safe-conduct, to guard his person from any violence which may be offered him on his journey; and to procure him a fair and candid trial, on his appearance before his lawful judges.—Has not this prince done all that is in his power to do? Doth his promise to such a man authorize him to interfere with a foreign and independent jurisdiction, or to usurp the rights of another? Do not the very words of the Council, 'because he has done all

'that is in his power to do,' prove that lawful promises are to be fulfilled?

Such jurisconsults, whether Catholics or Protestants, such as Prenus, Speklam, and others, as I have accidently read, concerning the nature of safe-conducts, lay down for a general rule, that they are never granted to suspend the execution of the laws. *Salvus conductus contra jus non datur.* It were nugatory in the Emperor Sigismund, presumptive heir to a kingdom, which Huss's doctrine had changed into a theatre of intestine wars, to grant a safe-conduct, the meaning and sense whereof would be equivalent to the following pass: 'Although you have set kingdoms in a blaze, by striking at the vitals of temporal authority, and overthrow the established religion of the land, yet go to Constance and come back, without appearing before your lawful judges, or retracting doctrines which have caused such disturbances in church and state.' Safe-conducts then are not granted to screen delinquents from punishment, when legally convicted; much less, to countenance disobedience to the laws, and disorder, by impunity.

The Council was the most competent judge of Huss's doctrine, in which he steadfastly persevered. Neither king nor emperor could deprive the bishops of privileges inseparably annexed to their characters, viz. spiritual jurisdiction, and the right of judging doctrines. Huss was degraded, and retrenched, according to the usual formalities, from a communion from which he had separated himself before. This is all the bishops could have done; this they acknowledge after the sentence of Huss's degradation was pronounced. 'This sacred synod of Constance, considering that the church of Christ has nothing further that it can do, decrees to leave John Huss to the judgment of the state.' His execution was in consequence of the imperial laws, enforced by the civil magistrate, as the execution of heretics in England and other Protestant states, has been in consequence of the imperial laws adopted by such powers. The Protestant clergy, as well as the clergy of Constance, decided upon points of doctrine, and went no farther.

Thus we see, that this superannuated charge of *violation of faith with heretics*, resembles those nightly spectres which

vanish upon a nearer approach. We find nothing in this Council, relative to such a charge, but a dispute about a pass granted to a man who goes to takes his trial before judges whose jurisdiction could not be superseded. Or if we intend to do justice to men with the same eagerness that we are disposed to injure them, we must acknowledge that the fathers of that Council condemned lies, frauds, perjury, and those horrors which Mr. Wesley would fain fix upon the Roman Catholics. The foundations, then, on which Mr. Wesley has erected his ærial fabric, being once sapped, the superstructure must fall of course; and his long train of false and unchristian assertions are swept away as a *spider's web*, before the *wind* of logical rules. *From absurd premises follows an absurd conclusion.*

What greater absurdity than Mr. Wesley's insisting upon a general Council's disclaiming a doctrine it never taught? If Mr. Wesley be so credulous as to believe that the Pope has horns, we must convene a general Council to declare that his forehead is smooth? Is it not sufficient to disclaim the truth of the odious imputation, when the false creed is fixed on us? We are really of opinion, that whoever believes us capable of harbouring such sentiments, is capable of putting the horrid maxims in practice. He must have studied the human heart, not in the books of nature, but in Hobbes's Leviathan; and should curse his fate that Providence had been so unkindly partial to him.

Rousseau declares, that if he had been present at the resurrection of Lazarus, he would not have believed it. 'The 'apparation,' says he, 'would have made a fool of me, by 'frightening me out of my senses, but it would never have 'made a convert of me.'

If a general Council were held in order to *disclaim* the ridiculous and abominable creed imputed to Roman Catholics, the sceptic, who gives no credit to their doctors and universities, to the oaths and declarations of millions, would give no credit to a convention of Bishops with the Pope at their head.

Let the appeal be made, not to stubborn sceptics, but to those who listen to the voice of reason, and consult the heart. This interior monitor, when passion and prejudice

are hushed into silence, is seldom consulted in vain. Let us not travel into Catholic States where perjury is punished with death, and every argument tending to prove that the Pope can absolve subjects from oaths, and grant a dispensation to commit all kinds of crimes, is confuted with a halter. Let us look nearer home, and compare what we see on one hand, with what is supposed on the other.

We see a million and half of Roman Catholics smarting under the most oppressive laws that the human heart could ever devise. When they were enacted, our ancestors had the lands of their fathers and the religion of their education. If perjury had been an article of their belief, they could have secured their inheritance, by taking an oath of abjuration. If papal dispensations were, in their opinion, lenitives to an ulcerated conscience, when, or where could they have been more seasonably applied, than at that time and place, where the properties of millions depended on the application?

If oaths against conviction, dispensations with perjury, and anticipated absolutions from future crimes, were articles of their belief, they would have prevented the blazing comets which scorch the living, and spread their influence to the dormitories of the dead, from kindling in their native air; and hindered cruelty, which is disarmed in the tyrant's breast at sight of the expiring victim, from pursuing them to the grave, and depriving them of the *cold* comfort of of mingling their ashes with those of their ancestors.*

Those laws which have banished our nobility from the Senate; deprived our gentry of the liberty of wearing a sword, either as a means of defence against the midnight assassin, or as a part of dress in the open day; the merchant of the power of realizing the fruits of his industry, in obtaining landed security for his money, or the liberty of purchasing; the lower class of people of the liberty of becom-

* The penal laws offered the most galling insult to the Roman Catholic gentry, at the time of their being enacted. Their burying places were in the ruins of old abbeys, founded by their ancestors. A law was enacted, prohibiting to bury in those dreary haunts of cats and weasels, and a fine of ten shillings was to be levied on every person who assisted at the funeral.

ing common soldiers, mayor's serjeants, or coal-measurers, and the valiant youth of serving his king, and reaping laurels in defence of his country—these laws are all still in being. It is true, to the honour of the Irish senate, they have staunched the blood flowing this long time past from one of the most tender veins of the human heart, by putting it out of the power of the profligate son to betray and rob his tender and hoary father. But, still the insidious neighbour can seize his neighbour's horse; the unfaithful husband can banish his chaste and virtuous wife, after the oath pledged in presence of God, at the nuptial solemnity; the designing villain can set fire to his house, and build a new one, at the expense of his Catholic neighbours, who were asleep whilst he himself was lighting the fagot.*

Thus like a *running evil*, in a successive gradation, they ulcerate every part of the body; and, though the lenity of the magistrate is a kind of mollifying application, that may assuage the sore for a certain time; yet whilst the noxious humour lurks within the recess of the law, we can never expect a radical cure.

'It is needless to comment upon the spirit of such laws.—'The very recital chills with horror.' So remarks my learned and worthy acquaintance, Doctor Campbell. 'Let it 'not be argued, that these laws are seldom put in execution.—'Is property to depend upon the courtesy of an avaricious, 'malignant neighbour! Damocles was, perhaps, safe enough 'under the suspended sword of Dionysius; but the appre-'hension of danger scared away those visions of happiness 'which he had seen in the envied pomp of tyranny.† 'Laws,' says the President Montesquieu, 'which do all the mischief 'that can be done, in cold blood;' and to which Lucretius might allude in his famous Epiphonema: *Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum! Could religion be productive of such mischief!* That philosopher, who in reading the epitaph of a voluptuous monarch, cried out that it was better suited to

* Mr. O'Leary was present when the case was tried in the county Court-house of Cork. He has likewise seen the venerable matron, after twenty-four years marriage, banished from the perjured husband's house, though it was proved in open court, that for six months before his marriage, he went to mass. But the law requires that he should be a year and a day of the same religion.

† Philosophical Survey of the South of Ireland, p. 251, 2.

an ox than to a king: *Bove quam rege dignius*, in reading the penal code, could form another antithesis: 'The seal 'that gave a sanction to such laws, should rather bear 'the impression of the claws of a lion than the head of a 'queen.'*

Such are the laws to whose unrelenting rigour we are every day exposed. The disposition of man, so averse to restraint, would soon suggest a method of dissolving the odious chains, which like those used by the Tuscan princes, who fastened living men to dead bodies, punish for an entire century, the living for the dead. The disposition of man, so averse to restraint, would soon shake off the oppressive burden, if the importunate voice of conscience did not silence the cries of nature, and intimate to the Catholic, that, 'death is preferable to perjury.' The remedy is in our own hands, and we daily refuse to apply it, though a small bandage could soon close up the bleeding veins of oppression, and a slight palliative remove the temporal grievances of which we complain. The churches are open, and though Mr. Wesley says, that 'our oaths are 'light as air,' yet one oath taken against the conviction of our consciences, would level the fences, and sweep away all the penal laws, as so many spiders' webs, to use his delicate expression. This is an argument which speaks to the feelings of man, and which no sophistry can ever refute. The priests themselves are interested in the profanation; for, by entering into a collusion with their flocks, and using their magic powers to forgive all sins, past, present, and to come, they could permit them to graze on the commons of legal indulgence; and by turning them into a richer pasture, expect more milk and wool. Avarice has ever been the reproach of the sanctuary: it is recorded in Scripture, that the priests of the old law used to take the best part of the victim to themselves, before it was offered to the God of Israel, and

* Queen Anne, the last sovereign of the Stuart line, who, after combining against her father, and violating the articles of Limerick, under pretence of strengthening the Protestant religion, gave a sanction to those laws; though her chief aim was to secure herself against the claims of her brother. Thus, religion often becomes an engine of policy, in the hands of sovereigns. Quere to Civilians: Should not oppressive laws cease, when the motives that gave rise to them subsist no more?

that Judas sold our Saviour for thirty pieces of silver. Mr. Wesley then must charitably presume, that no priest will forego his personal interest in compliment to his successor, and as it is his interest to impose upon his votaries, to slacken the rein, and shelter himself under the shade of the laws; either perjury is no part of his belief, or he must be too scrupulous; which in Mr. Wesley's opinion is *heresy* to believe. In ethics, as in mathematics, there are self-evident demonstrations; no proposition in Euclid is more clear than the following: 'A person who does not think perjury a crime, 'would not forfeit a guinea from reluctance to an oath.'—The Roman Catholics forfeit every privilege rather than take an oath against their conscience.

Are not they Adam's children? Have they not the same sensations of pain and pleasure as other men? Their vices and virtues, do they not run in the same channels with those of their Protestant neighbours? Are they not animated with the same desires of glory, allured by the blandishments of pleasure, courted by the charms of riches, as eager for the enjoyment of ease and opulence? If perjury be their creed, if their clergy be endued with the magic power of forgiving not only *present* but *future sins*, why do not they glide gently down the stream of legal liberty, instead of stemming the torrent of oppression? Why do not they qualify themselves for sitting in the Senate, and giving laws to the land in concert with their countrymen, instead of being the continual objects of penal sanctions? It is, that they are diametrically the reverse of what they are represented. Their religion forbids them to sport with the awful name of the Divinity.—They do not choose to impose upon their neighbours, or themselves, by perjury; nor run the risk of eternal death for a little honey. Were it otherwise, in three weeks time they could all read their recantations, and be on a level with the rest of their fellow-subjects: they could imitate that philosopher who had two religions—one for himself, and another for his country. Yet the archives of national justice can prove, that Catholics, reduced to the necessity of discovering against themselves, preferred the loss of their estates to the guilt of perjury, when a false oath could have secured

them in their property. Notwithstanding this imputed creed, they prefer the smarting afflictions of the body to the stinging remorses of the soul; and when worldly prosperities stand in competition with conscience, they rather choose to be its martyrs than executioners.

Gentlemen, reconcile, if you can, perjurers from principle, with sufferers from delicacy of conscience, and I shall style you the children of the *great Apollo*. But are not the Catholics a set of passive machines, veering at the breath of the Pope, who can dispense with them in any thing? 'Or 'what security can they give to Protestant governors, whilst 'they acknowledge his spiritual power?' If this be any objection to their loyalty, Catholic kings should banish their Catholic subjects, and introduce Protestants in their stead—for, as the Roman Catholic faith is the same all over the world, and that France and Spain are more convenient to the Pope than the Britannic islands, he would have more machines to move, more votaries to obey his mandates, and more facility in compassing his designs. In England and Ireland all the Protestants would oppose him; whereas in Catholic kingdoms, if his power has such an unlimited sway over the conscience of man, as Mr. Wesley asserts, every subject, nay, kings themselves, would be bound to obey him. But Catholic subjects know, that if God must have his own, Cæsar must have his due. In his quality of pontiff, they are ready to kiss the Pope's feet: but if he assumes the title of conqueror, they are ready to bind his hands. The very ecclesiastical benefices, which are more in the spiritual line, are not at his disposal. When England had more to dread from him than now, a Catholic parliament passed the statute of premunire; the bishops and mitred abbots preferred their own temporal interest to that of the Pope, and reserve the benefices to themselves, and the clergy under their jurisdiction. Charity begins at home, and I do not believe any Catholic so divested of it, as to prefer fifty pounds a year under the Pope's government, to an hundred pounds under that of a Protestant king. Queen Mary, so devoted to the Pope's cause, both on account of her religion, and the justice done to her mother by the inflexible resolution of the sovereign

pontiff, still would not cede her temporal rights, nor those of her subjects, in compliment to his spiritual power. After the reconciliation of her kingdom to the apostolical see, a statute was passed, enacting, that the Pope's bulls, briefs, &c. should be merely confined to spirituals, without interfering with the independence of her kingdom, or the rights of her subjects. The history of Europe proclaims aloud, that the Roman Catholics are not passive engines in the hands of Popes, and that they confine his power within the narrow limits of his spiritual province. They have often taken his cities, and opposed Paul's sword to Peter's keys, and silenced the thunders of the vatican with the noise of the cannon.—They know that Peter was a fisherman when kings swayed the sceptre, and that the subsequent grandeur of his successors, could never authorize him to alter the primitive institution that commands subjects to obey their rulers, and to give Cæsar his due.

With regard to his spiritual power, you will be surprised, gentlemen, when I tell you, that, from Lodowic Muggleton down to John Wesley, those who have instituted new sects amongst the Christians, have assumed more power than the Pope dare to assume over the Catholics.

They may add or diminish: but, with regard to the Pope, the landmarks are erected, and we would never permit him to remove them. If he attempted to preach up five sacraments instead of seven, we would immediately depose him. Mr. Wesley may alter his faith as often as he pleases, and prevail on others to do the same; but the Pope can never alter ours: we acknowledge him, indeed, as head of the Church, for every society must have a link of union, to guard against confusion and anarchy; and, without annexing any infallibility to his person, we acknowledge his title to precedence and pre-eminence. But, in acknowledging him as the *first pilot to steer the vessel*, we acknowledge a compass by which he is to direct his course. He is to preserve the vessel, but never to expose it to shipwreck. Any deviation from the laws of God, the rights of nature, or the faith of our fathers, would be the fatal rock on which the Pope himself would split. In a word, the Pope is our first Pastor; he may feed, but cannot poison us: we acknowledge no

power in him, either to alter our faith, or to corrupt our morals.

If the Pope's power were then rightly understood, his spiritual supremacy would give no more umbrage to the King of Great Britain, than the jurisdiction of a diocesan bishop. But deep rooted prejudices can scarcely be removed; and little can be expected from the generality, when the learned themselves are hurried by the tide of popular error.

From want of rightly understanding the case, and attention to the discriminating line drawn by the Catholics between the Pope's spiritual and temporal power, Sir William Blackstone himself gave into the snare of vulgar delusion. This learned expositor of England's common law, declares the Roman Catholics as well entitled to every legal indulgence as the other dissenters from the established religion, maugre their *real presence*, *purgatory*, *confessions*, &c. But still the Pope's ghost haunts him to such a degree, that he would fain have the Catholics abjure his spiritual supremacy. But Sir William, who has exposed himself to the censure of Mr. Sheridan, in establishing the formidable right of conquest over Ireland, and to the animadversions of the divines, by declaring that 'an act of parliament 'can alter the religion of the land,' (as if, by act of parliament, we should all become Turks, be circumcised, and expect an earthly Paradise;) has exposed himself to the reproaches of every smatterer in divinity, who could ask him: If, in acknowledging the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishop of London, he encroached upon the privileges of the Lord Mayor.

But in talking of the power of parliament 'to alter the 'religion of the land,' Sir William has argued from facts: and in talking of the *spiritual* power of the Pope, he must have argued from hear-say. The lawyer may be excused when he talks of spiritual powers: but what apology can be pleaded by the apostle and divine, who, like Tristram Shandy's priest, baptizes the child before he is born, and grants Popes and priests the power of forgiving all sins, not only past and present, but sins to come; this Mr. Wesley asserts: it is surprising magic that forgives now, the sin that

is to be committed a hundred years hence: let no one deprive Mr. Wesley of the glory of the invention. Past sins, in our belief, can be forgiven by Popes and priests, not as primary agents, but as subordinate instruments in the hands of the Divinity; not according to the absolute will of the priest, but according to the dispositions of the penitent, and the clauses of the covenant of mercy, which the priest can neither alter nor disannul.

The dark recesses of the criminal consciences must be searched. The monster must be stifled in the heart that gave it birth. A sincere sorrow for past guilt, a firm resolution to avoid future lapses, and every possible atonement to the injured Deity, and the injured neighbour, are the previous and indispensable requisites. Take away any of the three conditions, and the Pope's and priest's absolution are but empty sounds; the keys of the church rattle in vain, they are no more than the mutterings of sorcerers, or words of incantation pronounced over a dead body, without ever imparting to it the genial heat of animation and vitality.—Popes nor priests can do no more than God himself—and the Scriptures declare, that God will never forgive the sinner, without sorrow and repentance. And the schoolmen dispute, whether, by an absolute power, he could raise to the beatific vision, a soul polluted with the defilements of guilt. If then the priest's absolution be any plea against Roman Catholics, it may as well be said, that the promise of the Most High, 'to pardon the re-'pentant sinner, although his sins were as red as scarlet,' encourages men to commit sin; or that a man may take an oath contrary to his conscience, under the idea, that a subsequent repentance will gain forgiveness and pardon.

'But is it not intolerable presumption in man to arrogate 'such power?' Be it so; I am no apologist when I write in a public paper: controversy I leave to the schools. If I make my confession to a priest, what is it to my neighbour? Society will gain by the *pretended* superstition; for the most immortal Catholics are those who seldom or never frequent the sacraments. I look on the pretended conferences of Numa Pompilius with the nymph Egeria, as a mere fiction, devised

by that political prince. Yet I admire the wisdom of the legislator, who introduced a plan of softening the savage manners of his uncivilized subjects, and smoothing the asperity of stubborn nature by religious awe. Those who are unacquainted with the nature of confession, may consider it as *priest-craft*, yet neither master nor landlord will ever lose by the imposture; when their servants and tenants kneel to a priest, whose duty is to revive in their minds the notions of probity and virtue. Thus, the wisest of the Protestant churches have never discountenanced confession: the form of absolution, and the previous dispositions required on the part of the penitent are set down at large in the liturgy; and as to the power of forgiving sins, granted to the ministers of religion, express mention is made of it in the Scriptures. Mr. Wesley must acknowledge the power, whether it consists in the priestly absolution, or in the preaching of the Gospel, or 'in pious canticles, sung with a skilful tongue and 'harmonious voice, lifting the rising soul and plunging it into 'a mystical slumber, as soothing and soft as the balm of 'Gilead.'*

Such Christians as acknowledge original sin, and the virtue of baptism to cancel the unavoidable debt, must acknowledge that the minister of religion effaces the stain by applying the elements. If the Catholics believe that by the institution of Christ, the minister of religion can forgive sins; they are convinced at the same time, that he is no more than a subordinate agent, who derives his power from a superior being, in absolving the adult, as he derives his power from the same source, when he purifies the soul of the infant. I know full well that God could change the heart of man, and forgive sins in young and old, without the interposition of a human being. The prophet, who was consulted by two Jewish kings, and before he would give an answer, called for a harp, could have received the prophetic inspiration, without touching the strings of the tuneful lyre. Christ could have restored the blind man to his sight without applying

* See an abridgment of Wesley's journal, where he compares the impressions he made on his hearers to the balm of Gilead. As far as I can recollect, he relates in his large journal a surprising history of one of his acquaintances, who fell into a pious slumber, which deserves to be recorded in the History of the Seven Sleepers.

the mud to his eyes, and converted the world without exposing his apostles to martyrdom. But am I to bring him to an account for using intermediate agents; or what I think to be an institution of the Divinity, is it not my duty to abide by it? Happy those who can save themselves without the assistance of any other! Thrice happy Mr. Wesley! who is already registered in the *book of life*, and empowered to grant *inamissable* security to others for the anticipated enjoyment of eternal bliss. He can sum up the number of the holy souls who have climbed up the steps of the mystical ladder, and on the highest step of all, as on the ramparts of an impregnable fortress, reckon so many souls confirmed in a state of *inamissable* sanctity;* whilst I am so miserable as not to know whether I am worthy of love or hatred, and have millions of times more reason than St. Paul to solicit the prayers of my fellow-christians, *lest that in praying for others, I myself may become a reprobate.*

In our communion, Gentlemen, we never hold forth our confessions and absolutions as licences for guilt, but as curbs to the passions. Our priests make their confession, as well as the laity; for no priest can absolve himself, nor flatter himself with impunity in committing present or future crimes.—Our directors point out the path to the wayfaring pilgrim, between the two extremes of *despair* and *presumption:* to guard against the first, the gates of penance are thrown open, as so many avenues that lead to mercy; to guard against the second, the dread of God's judgments, the uncertainty of the last hour, the abuses of God's graces, which, if neglected, swell the long list of crimes and punishments, are held forth in all their terrors.

We represent to the guilty conscience, sinking under a weight of anxieties and crimes, the penitent thief crying out for mercy, and obtaining pardon. We represent to the obstinate and presumptuous sinner, the impenitent thief,

* See Wesley's journal, where he declares, that on his visitation, he met so many sanctified, so many justified, and so many confirmed in love. Qui potest capiat. I cannot comprehend this mystical divinity. By confirmation in love he must mean, that whoever believes himself once arrived at that happy state, can sin no more. I am glad to see a fellow-creature confirmed in the love of God. But I am sorry to find some so ill-confirmed in the love of their neighbour, as to tell half Europe to their faces, that they are perjurers, and to apologize for a rabble, who set fire to their neighbours houses. This is what we call an ARDENT, or BURNING LOVE.

threatening reprobation. We know, that whilst the serpent is raised up in the wilderness, no wound is incurable: we know, on the other hand, that, when criminal cities had filled up the measure of their iniquity, in vain did Abraham lift up his hands to heaven, to solicit their pardon. If we place between the Judge and the sinner a great Mediator; though the Mediator and Judge be the same, yet we place between the Mediator and sinner an awful Judge. We earnesly recommend the frequent use of confession, because man is so frail that he stands in frequent need of it. But still we recommend it, not as loose reins to humour the sinner's passions, but as a stiff bridle to check their sallies. We never encourage our penitents to new disorders, but inspire them with detestation for former guilt, and fear of swelling the score; for we know the danger of affronting mercy by new crimes, but cannot know the fatal point where paternal goodness is limited. Thus we lead our penitents in the intermediate path between despair and presumption, by the delicate clue of hope and fear, until they reach the critical term, where the soul, after bursting the chains of its earthly prison, takes its flight into the vast region of spirits; and even when arraigned before the judgment seat, we tremble for its destiny. Such, Gentlemen, is the nature of confession, whether you consider it in a useful or abusive light.

Had Mr. Wesley, who, after publishing twenty-six volumes, knows every thing, even the language of birds, known its nature, he would not have adduced it as an argument in justification of intolerance, but rather left the imputed power of forgiving all kinds of sin, past, present, and to come, as a flower of rhetoric to grace the garden of the Cynics. Away then with his priestly absolutions and dispensing powers.— He assumes more power than any priest could pretend to. Away with violation of faith with heretics: we acknowledge no heresy in the duties of social life, or the obligations of Christian virtues.

Such, Gentlemen, are the principles of the Roman Catholics, they are quite the reverse of Mr. Wesley's charges.— Let the impartial public decide, whether a set of perjurers, authorised to commit all kinds of crimes with impunity, (such as the Roman Catholics are painted) would suffer one

week on the score of conscience? In our faith we follow the maxim of St. James, 'Whoever transgresses the law in 'one point, is guilty of all.' The same rule holds good in moral; in allowing that a man is bad in committing one crime, we do not allow that he is guiltless in committing another. The sacrifice must be entire; and grace never sanctifies a divided victory. The fabric of our religion is so closely cemented—the links of the chain which unites all the articles of our faith, are so fastened within each other, that if you take off one of the links, or loosen a stone in the edifice, the whole system is entirely destroyed. If then all the horrors fixed upon us by the dark pencil of misrepresentation, be articles of our belief, when we disclaim them upon oath, we are real heretics, and as well entitled to every legal indulgence, as those who go to church, and swear against Transubstantiation.

We admire the integrity of Regulus, who suffered the most exquisite tortures, rather than violate an oath given to his enemies. In the administration of distributive justice, the magistrate must give credit to the Heathen, who swears by his false gods, to the Jew, who swears by the Old Testament, and to the Turk, who swears by the Koran. In cases of life and property, he gives credit to the oath of a Roman Catholic, whether he appears as a witness or juror. In giving no credit to the oaths of Roman Catholics, when they disclaim *perjury*, *dispensations for frauds*, *rebellion*, *treachery*, &c. he betrays his judgment, and insults humanity. But, if judgment has been ever betrayed, or humanity insulted, they are now betrayed and insulted by those persons who compose what they call the *Protestant Associations*, of whom Mr. Wesley is become the apologist. In taking up the pen to conclude this letter, I received their *Appeal to the People of Great Britain*, printed in London by J. W. Pasham.

Mr. Wesley, who has abridged *his own journal* to give it a greater circulation, has abridged this six-penny pamphlet, in his first letter. In the beginning of the American war, he published his 'Calm Address,' in order to unite the colonies to the mother country. The 'balm of Gilead' proving ineffectual beyond the Atlantic, he now has recourse to caustics

at home. Three years ago he intended to unite us: now he intends to divide us. Thus we find Penelope's web in his *religious looms:* what he wove three years ago, he now unravels.

In this 'Appeal,' on which he passes such encomiums, and the design whereof he declares to be 'benevolent,' you can perceive the dormant seeds of antiquated fanaticism sprouting anew, and vegetating into religious frenzy, which has deluged the earth with an ocean of calamities, and which would give heathen princes room to glory, that the Gospel has never been preached in their dominions. An apothecary's shop has never been stocked with more drugs, than this 'Appeal' is stocked with massacres. They have inserted in it, the bull, 'In Cœna Domini,' which has never been received in any Catholic kingdom; and from an old book, which was foisted on the public in the beginning of the Reformation, as containing the fees of the Roman chancery, they conclude, that 'a Roman Catholic can sleep with a 'woman in a church, and commit there other enormities, by 'paying nine shillings;' and that 'he may murder a man, 'and commit incest,* on paying seven shillings and six-'pence,' though shillings and six-pences are English coins, not current in Italy; and in Catholic countries, the murderer expires on the wheel, and whoever commits incest, or profanes the churches by carnal sins, is burnt at the stake. What is more surprising, Gentlemen, these new apostles of the *Gordonian Association*, who, to use the words of our old friend, Hudibras,

'Their holy faith do found upon
'The sacred text of pike and gun.'

imagine that they are delegates of heaven for the salvation of souls: their hands do not brandish the glittering spear on the American plains, where d'Estaing and Prevost dispute the laurel; but, like Samuel, deploring the loss of Saul, their eyes are bathed in tears, and their 'bowels yearn for mil-'lions of spirits that have no existence but in the prescience 'of God,' who can pity an error, and forgive it, and who is more concerned in their salvation, than Lord G.....G..... or Mr. Wesley.

* See the "Appeal from the Protestant Associations," p. 18.—Printed by Pasham.

I am afraid, Gentlemen, that you mind your own souls and bodies more than you mind those of others. To rouse you from your spiritual lethargy, and inflame you with some sparks of love for your neighbour, I send you a piece of a sermon taken from the 'Appeal of the Associations.'

After deploring the 'loss of millions of common people, 'who are prohibited from reading the scriptures,' (though it were charity to teach them first how to spell,) 'and who have 'souls as infinite, in value and duration, as the proudest pre-'lates. or highest monarchs upon earth,'—they go on: 'to 'tolerate Popery, is to be instrumental to the perdition of 'immortal souls now existing, and of millions of spirits that 'at present have no existence but in the prescience of God; 'and is the direct way to provoke the vengeance of an holy 'and jealous God, to bring down destruction on our fleets 'and armies.'* I really imagined that the Protestant associations were not so cruel as to refuse me mercy, and exclude me from the kingdom of heaven, if I lead an honest, sober, and virtuous life. I am convinced, that several of Admiral Rodney's sailors are Roman Catholics, and that the bullets which *told so well*, in mauling poor Langara, were fired by hands that *crossed a Popish* forehead. Oliver Cromwell, seeking the Lord, and preaching upon the Sabbath-day, in a leather breeches and buff waistcoat, with his trusty sabre by his side,† did not scruple to enter into a confederacy with Cardinal Mazarini, against the Spaniards: it was equal to England which of the two was foremost in the breach, the French Dragoon with his whiskers, after saying *Hail Mary*, or the *Round-head* with his leather cap, after *groaning in the spirit.* Spain lost Dunkirk, and England triumphed.

King William, who, to his honour, could never be prevailed on to violate the articles of Limerick, had six thousand Roman Catholics in his army, when he fought the battle of the Boyne; and the Catholics and Protestants of Switzerland maintain their independence against all the powers of the Continent, in consequence of their union. But the Protestant Association, like Ezekiel, have swallowed a book

* See the "Appeal from the Protestant Associations," page 18, and cry out Obone! obone! obone!

† See Gregorio Leti, in his Life of Cromwell.

in which are written *verses*, and *lamentations*, and *woe!* Already their luminous souls, enlightened by the prophetic spirit, see future times unlocking their distant gates, and pouring forth millions of monsters; and from a desire to procure the salvation of Adam's children, it is to be dreaded, that, at long run, they will imitate the holy fanatics of Denmark, who, in order to procure heaven for young infants, after being baptized, used to slaughter them in their cradles.

AN

HUMBLE REMONSTRANCE

TO THE

SCOTCH AND ENGLISH INQUISITORS,

By way of an Apostrophe.

GENTLEMEN,

As a colour to your disorderly and unwarrantable proceedings, you impose on the ignorant by your cant words of *violation of faith with heretics.* Like Boileau's heroes, you are ransacking old books, canvassing legends of exaggerated massacres,* and like scholars, who, after repeating their lesson, fling about the bones and skulls piled up in charnel houses, you haunt the living with the images of the dead.—Modern philosophy proves the existence of colours in the eye, but not in exterior objects; what is true in the physical world, is more so in your system of ethics—the purple hue and black dye in which you would fain misrepresent us to our king and the public, are the result of your organs; and

* In their Appeal they relate that a hundred thousand Protestants were massacred in 1641; at that time there were thirty Catholics for every Protestant, and a hundred escaped for every single Protestant that perished. Let now a balance be struck, and the numbers of inhabitants calculated, and Ireland must have been but one large city, as crowded as the streets of Rome, in the times of Marius and Sylla. This massacre, which should be effaced from the records of the nation, as well as from the memory of man, was begun by a fanatical soldiery, who intended to extirpate the Papists and malignants. Whoever has a mind to be informed about this massacre, may read Doctor Warner, Mr. Brooke's Trial of the Roman Catholics, and Doctor Curry's Historical Memoirs, and his History of the Civil Wars of Ireland. But whoever has a mind to be led astray, let him read Sir John Temple's (Secretary to Ireton) stupid legend. The Appeal of the Protestant Associations—and Hume's theatrical Description, who, nevertheless, reduces greatly the number, which could never amount to five or six thousand—He relates, that in hatred to the English, the Irish used to WOUND THEIR COWS, and in this torturing situation turn them into the woods to prolong their sufferings. In my opinion, under such a government as was then, they wanted more to eat them. And I am sorry that the gravity of the Historian has permitted Mr. Hume to rank cows amongst the MARTYRS OF RELIGION.

the abortives you lay at our doors, derive their existence from yourselves. You would fain deprive us of the rights of mankind, for crimes we never committed; for thoughts which we disclaim, and whereof the Scrutinizer and Searcher of hearts is the only competent judge. Thus you imitate the tyrant, who put an inoffensive citizen to death, because in his uneasy slumbers, disturbed by the guilt of injuries offered to others, he dreamt that he was cutting his throat. Our actions are the best exponents of our sentiments: our conduct is peaceable; but, as for you, your actions and conduct betray you, as the roaring, and impression of his claws, betray the lion. And woe to the game that is unprotected by the keeper! in an enlightened age, when the cheerful eyes of philosophy and religion cannot bear the sight of frantic fanaticism, banished from all quarters of Europe, it found shelter among you, with its distorted features, and numerous train of calamities and evils. Generous hosts! and worthy of such a guest, you sheltered, you warmed, you gave new life, to a refugee entitled to your patronage. And as a prodigal child, thriving ill in foreign countries, you received with the arms of a tender parent, you clad him in his *first robes*, you killed a fat calf, which the burning rafters of your neighbours' houses have roasted, and at his reception the symphony of *pious raptures* was heard in your streets.

Whilst, in Ireland, the ministers of religion, in conformity to the Gospel rule, were preaching love and benevolence; whilst in Ireland sixty thousand armed Protestants, without any controul, but the great principles of honour and valour, enemy to degenerate cruelty, were protecting the peaceable citizen and defenceless cottager, without any distinction of sects or parties; whilst the Irish Volunteers were setting to the world the rare example of armed legions, without the severe subordination of military discipline, behaving with that noble decorum which precludes complaints, and attracts admiration, your pulpits resounded with the harsh language of the savage leader haranguing his warriors, and throwing down the hatchet as a signal of destruction to the neighbouring tribes. Some of your women, divested of tenderness and pity, so peculiar to the fair and delicate sex, reviving in their

persons the savage sternness of the Spartan matrons urging on their sons to battle, rejoiced in the open day on seeing their neighbours' houses in a blaze, and blessed God that they lived to see the day when Popish abominations were purified with fire. One should imagine, that such of you as petitioned the king and parliament against granting a free trade to Ireland, should rest satisfied, without petitioning against your inoffensive neighbours. If you glory in the purity of your religion, and in treading in the steps of its Author, treat us as Christ himself would treat us, if he were on earth. He deprived no man of his property, nor of the indulgence and protection of the laws. If you glory in the purity of the Christian religion, call to mind that it suggests humility, and deference to people of superior power and judgment. Your king, your peers, and your commons, are deemed the first in dignity and wisdom; but I forget that you are well versed in the bible, which says, 'he that is first 'amongst you, let him be the last.' The Scripture must be fulfilled: take then the lead, and force them to trample on their own laws, and to banish their subjects.

Mention no longer 'violation of faith with heretics.' You violate all the laws of civil society; in dissolving the ties of friendship, and pointing out your fellow-subjects as the victims of legal severity, you split and rend the nation: you weaken its power, and trespass upon the respect due to your rulers, whom, instead of being the fathers of their people you would fain force to become the heads of factions.

You violate the sacred rights of nature; her bountiful Author declares, that 'he makes his sun shine on the good 'and bad.' The light of the sun, the brilliancy of the stars, the sweetness of the fruit, the balsamic effluvia of flowers, are dispensed with a liberal hand to the Heathen and Idolater. Must you deprive your neighbours of gifts common to all Adam's children, because they stick to a religion which all your forefathers professed, and which, if wrong, can hurt no man but themselves?

In vain do you attempt to impose upon the public, with extracts and spurious canons, obsolete decrees, patches of councils, and legends of massacres, in order to fix a creed on

us. The world knows that Roman Catholics sway the sceptre of authority in kingdoms and republics. The very nature then of civil society is a manifest contradiction to the creed you impute to us: for, if we were no more than machines veering at the breath of Popes and Priests, whom neither conscience, religion, the sacred ties of an oath, nor the fear of God's judgment, can restrain, patentees of guilt, and sure of impunity, we could not form a society for the space of one year: for, in such a society, the notions of vice and virtue would be confounded; the blackest crimes and the purest virtue reduced to the same level; the descipline of morals destroyed; the harmony of the body politic dissolved; the brother armed against the brother; and if, by a kind of miracle, in such a cursed number of men, a second Abel could be found, the earth would soon groan with the cries of his blood. If divines have attempted to demonstrate the existence of God from the nature of civil society, the very nature of civil society demonstrates the falsehood of the creed with which you compliment us. And, if the gloomy plan of such a horrid republic pleases your imaginations, go and lay the foundations of it in some distant part of the earth. Be yourselves its members and governors, for no Christian could live there.

When the delicate pencils of the Gibbons, Reynolds, and Marmontels, will paint the political scenery of the eighteenth century—when on the extensive canvass, they will represent the gloom of long-reigning prejudice scattering, as the clouds of night, at the approach of the rising sun—when they will paint the poniard, drenched in human blood, snatched from the hand of stern *persecution*—the French praying in concert with the American—the Americans invited into Russia—the order of military merit established in favour of Protestants, in the palace of a Catholic King—Ireland rising from the sea, covered with her Fabii and Scipios, pointing their spears to distant shores, and holding forth the olive and sheaf of corn to their neighbours of all denominations—when they will contrast the present to former times—shew the happy result of a change of system, and prove that the world is refined—You, painted in as frightful attitudes as the group of figures in Raphael's Judgment, with stern fanaticism in your

countenances, a bible in one hand and a fagot in the other—you, I say, will be an exception to the general rule: the world will read with surprise, that, in seventeen hundred and eighty, there have been fanatics in England and Scotland, that gave birth to so many illustrious writers. Your transactions shall be recorded in the appendix to the history of Jack Straw and Wat Tiler; and your chaplains and apologies shall be ranked with James Nailer and Hugh Peters.

And thus, Gentlemen, I finish my Apostrophe.

Should Mr. Wesley, or any of his associators, think it worth their while to make any remarks on these letters, they cannot justly expect a rejoinder. They have started forth the unprovoked aggressors; and, not satisfied with attempting to deprive the Roman Catholics of their rights as subjects, they have slandered and aspersed their characters. I am no stranger to the ground on which they will attack me: either the rusty weapons of old councils, or a catalogue of old massacres, will be drawn out of their mouldering arsenals: arms as ill suited to the eighteenth century, as Saul's helmet was to David's head. I will be attacked with the Council of Lateran, the wars of the Albigenses, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, &c. I am a Christian, and deny the transmigration of souls: I am nowise concerned in past transactions, or if my religion be charged with them, I have in my hands the cruel arms of retaliation:—

I shall divide the charge into two branches—barbarous actions and barbarous doctrine. If Mr. Wesley reckons all those who are not, or have not been, in communion with the see of Rome, in the number of heretics, and himself amongst them, as doubtless he does, I shall then lay at his door, all the abominable and seditious doctrines taught by those whom he styles heretics, from the time of Simon the Magician, down to our days—the impurities of the Gnostics; the enchantments of the Ophites; the perjury and frauds of the Priscillianists; the errors of the Albigenses, and millions besides. If, from these distant times, I make a transition to a nearer

æra, I shall prove to him, from the works, not only of insignificant writers of the reformed religion, but of the very founders of the reformation, who assumed as much power over their followers, as the Pope assumes over the Catholics, that they taught doctrines cruel, immoral, and seditious; and that the most horrid barbarities were committed in consequence of those doctrines. Calvin not only commits heretics to the flames, but moreover writes a book in justification of his proceedings; and in his commentaries on the Scriptures he teaches, that '*Usury* is lawful.' Luther, Malancthon, and Bucer, have authorized polygamy, and permitted a prince to marry a second wife during the life of the first. The decrees of the Synod of Dort, caused great persecutions in Holland. Knox and his followers propagated the Gospel with fire and sword. I have already mentioned the doctrine of John Huss, and his master Wickliff, so inimical to sovereigns.

If I take a review of the greatest champions who, within these four hundred years, have undertaken the Herculean task of overthrowing the kingdom of Antichrist, I see them all claiming a mission from Heaven, as well as Mr. Wesley, and still overturning thrones and empires. I see Germany deluged with oceans of blood; boors headed by fanatical preachers, promising the deluded multitude to receive the bullets in their sleeves, attacking their princes and sovereigns; tailors paving their way to the throne over heaps of mangled carcasses, in order to re-establish the *kingdom of Jerusalem; apostles* heading armies, and commanding, by the last will, their dearly beloved children reformed from the errors of Popery, to make a drum* of their skins, in order to rouse the saints to battle; the streets of London ensanguined with the gore of peaceable citizens, destroyed by the fifth-monarchy men, proclaiming king Jesus; communion tables stained with the blood of Protestant kings; solemn leagues and covenants sealed for the extirpation of Papists and malignants,† and entered into with as much eagerness as Hannibal entered Italy, after swearing the destruction of the Romans, upon the Carthaginian altars; the poniard lifted by the hand of religious madness, and committing such slaughter and carnage, that

* Zisca, a follower of John Huss.

† A name given to the Protestants of the established church.

people propose the disagreeable and odious problem, 'whether religion has been of greater use than harm to mankind?'

Still I am inclined to exculpate religion from the blame of calamities which can be traced back to the rage of fanatical preachers, the cruelty of governors, the policy and craft of ministers of state, as to their genuine sources. 'Matters 'were first embroiled in the cabinet,' says Rousseau, 'and 'then the leading men stirred up the common people in the 'name of God.'

In the midst of this religious rage, I see humanity asserting her right, and resuming her empire: I see Catholic governors refusing to comply with the imperious mandates of a cruel king, and a no less cruel queen, at the time of the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and Catholic bishops saving all the Protestants in their diocese: I see in Ireland, the great Protestant bishop Bedel with his clans, and thousands, in the free exercise of their religion, in the midst of a Catholic army, whilst a Protestant bishop bleeds at the foot of a communion-table in Scotland, for reading the English liturgy:— Thus, I am convinced that people of all denominations would be happy together, if their clergy recommended mutual love and benevolence; and that, if we divested ourselves of passion, religion would never arm the hand with the poniard. If Innocent the Third excommunicated the heretics of his time, Innocent the Eleventh entered into a league with Protestant kings.

Thus, gentlemen, you see how the world changes. On the wide theatres spread by the revolutions of time, new characters daily appear, and different circumstances are productive of different events. It is in vain to ransack old councils, imperial constitutions, and ecclesiastical canons, whether genuine or spurious, against heretics, in order to brand the present generation of Catholics. In the very city, I mean Rome, where the general council of Lateran was held, Protestants are caressed, and live with ease and comfort. Travellers agree, that it is the theatre of civility, benevolence and politeness. In the German empire, where, by the constitutions of Frederic the Second, heretics were condemned to the stake, all religions enjoy full liberty. In some places.

the Catholic priest and Calvinist minister officiate in the same church, and bishoprics are alternately governed by Catholic and Protestant prelates. All laws, whether civil or ecclesiastical, are done away by time, when the motives that gave them rise subsist no longer. And none but a slave to bigotry and prejudice will confound the eighteenth with the thirteenth century. Because Father Roger Bacon was imprisoned as a sorcerer, on account of his extensive knowledge in astronomy, perspective, &c. or that Gallileo's doctrine of the motion of the earth was condemned by a numerous tribe of divines, headed by seven Cardinals, under the eyes of the Roman Pontiff, must it be obtruded on the public, that the Roman Catholics must consider the motion of the earth round the sun, as heresy, or firmly believe that there is magic or witchcraft in the *Camera obscura*, because Father Bacon, who described it, was seven years confined in prison? Hence from the opinions of men, or the actions of Popes, or the disciplinary canons of Councils, or the proceedings of Bishops who composed them, in one age, there is no arguing to the belief of men in another. Popes have attempted to absolve subjects from their allegiance to their sovereigns; it is no more an article of my belief that they could do it by the authority of the keys, than it is an article of my belief, that I can strike a king on the cheek, because Calvin teaches, that, 'earthly princes abdicate their authority when they 'erect themselves against God,' and that, 'we ought rather 'spit in their faces, than obey them.'* Mr. Wesley and the *Association* would do well to analyze some of that doctor's writings, and Knox's sermons, and to insert them in their Appeal, as a contrast to the obsolete canons which they have extracted from Sir Richard Steel's Appendix:—*Erect themselves against God*, is a phrase merely spiritual, and of a fatal tendency, because the broachers of such doctrines think it a sufficient plea against kings not inclined to receive *truths*, they themselves are prompted to preach: and as every one thinks himself in the right, error has many chances for the sword of authority. But in my opinion, *Peter's pence*, not Peter's keys, have founded the claims of Popes, when they

* Calvin in Daniel, chap. 6. v. 22.

made the unsuccessful attempt. To the investiture of bishopries in Germany, which brought on the great broils between Popes and Emperors, was annexed some temporal emolument, founded upon compacts between the two powers. The English monarchs made their kingdom tributary to the apostolical see. If, then, pontiffs have deviated from the primitive paths in meddling in the temporals of kings, the reason is obvious. They had prescription to plead; oaths and treaties to support their claims. In the conduct of kings, choosing them for arbiters of their quarrels, and liege lords of their territories, they found a specious pretext to punish the infraction of treaties, and the breach of prerogative. A repetition of the same acts, introduced custom. Custom supported by time, obtains the force of a law. The law bound the parties concerned, and the violation of the law has been attended with penalties. Hence the deposition of an emperor was more owing to the code and pandects of Justinian, than to the gospel of Christ. Hence Henry the Eighth, and Queen Elizabeth's pretended danger from the Popes who threatened them, and attempted in vain to absolve their subjects from their allegiance.

The Popes considered themselves as the liege lords of the kingdom of England, after receiving for so many years a tribute from its sovereigns: they never absolved the Catholics of Denmark and Sweden, from their allegiance to Protestant kings, because they could plead no stipulations. According to the canon law, a hundred years prescription can be pleaded against the Church of Rome. A hundred years and more have elapsed, since any Pope has attempted to absolve subjects from their allegiance; though armies have been poured into his territories, and his cities taken by princes. Kings have nothing to dread from an abrogated power, abolished by the same cause that gave it rise.—But if empire be founded in grace, and not in the rights of nature, or the laws of civil society; if a deviation from the immutable truth that saw the world in its cradle, and is to preside at its dissolution, be a plea against kings; let them be eternally armed with the scales of the Leviathan, against the barbed irons to which they are exposed, from those who think themselves the only persons enlightened with the rays

of gospel knowledge. Nothing then is to be apprehended from Popes. Less is to be apprehended from spurious canons, or the memory of councils which gave up the ghost six hundred years ago. And any inference from the proceedings of the fathers of the council of Lateran, or obsolete texts of the canon law, against former heretics, to alarm the Protestants of our days, is the fruit of ignorance or malice, or both. The Protestants of our days sway the sceptre of authority. Kingdoms and republics, laws and constitutions, fœderal unions, and civil compacts, blessings in peace, and triumphs in war, the allegiance of their subjects, and protection the result of allegiance, record them in the annals of fame, and put them on the same level with the Cæsars to whom tribute and submission are due. How are they connected with the motley rabble of heretics who appeared and disappeared in former times, overturning and attacking church and state, and attacked by both in their turn! No state acknowledged their power; no band of civil union linked them together; no subjects swore allegiance to them; no Catholic recognized a king, parliament, or magistrate amongst the Albigenses, whom people dignify with the title of Protestants; and whom Protestant powers would consider as the pest and bane of society, if such were now in their dominions. Disciples of the Manicheans, they admitted two supreme and independent principles; and granted two wives, called Colla and Colliba, to the God of Truth. Had their doctrine been confined to mere speculations, in an age more enlightened than the thirteenth century, when the council of Lateran was held, in all appearance, humanity would pity them, and philosophy would smile at their errors.

But this wild theory was still surpassed by the most monstrous practices. They considered marriage as a state of perdition; but chastity was not one of their vows.

More could be said; but I am afraid that my readers already blush: and whoever dignifies the Albigenses with the title of Protestants, in order to inflame the rage, and kindle the rancour of fellow-subjects, by a recital of the ill treatment of those pretended martyrs, should not only blush, but hide himself.

Let none imagine, that whatever is mentioned in the sessions of a general council, is an article of faith. There are decrees of discipline which are at the discretion of kingdoms or provinces either to reject or adopt. There are articles of faith which, in our opinion, neither time, place, or circumstances can alter. Thus, the council of Trent, which commands the Roman Catholics, under pain of *anathema*, or curse, to believe the necessity of baptism, and the reality of original sin, is universally received in all Catholic countries, as far as it confines itself to the decision of speculative points, and proposes them as articles of belief: but, where the same council decrees, that the manor or land on which a duel is fought, with the connivance of the owner, should be confiscated and applied to pious uses, it is rejected. Though the motive of the decree is laudable, as it tends to suppress vice and restrain the passions; yet, as the means, such as the forfeiture of lands, &c. are quite out of the spiritual line, this decree of discipline is not received. By the same rule, two things are to be considered relative to the council of Lateran, often quoted, and as often misapplied. The fathers of that council have anathematized the errors of the Albigenses, so repugnant to reason, morality, and the principles of revealed religion, and every similar error extolling itself against the orthodox faith. So far they confined themselves within the limits of their spiritual provinces, and so far every Roman Catholic submits to their decrees. But when they proceeded further, and granted the lands of the persons whom they condemned as heretics, to the Catholics who would take possession of them; no Roman Catholic is concerned in a verdict that disposes of temporal property: for neither popes nor councils have been appointed as the supreme and infallible arbiters of succession to thrones, the transfer of property, or temporal affairs, by Him who refused to compromise matters between two brothers, and declared, that *his kingdom is not of this world.* Nor is it to be presumed, that the ambassadors who assisted at the council, would betray the interests of their kings, who often excepted against the competency of spiritual tribunals, as to the decision of temporal rights. And as to the distinction between articles of faith, and canons of discipline, we find it even in the New Testament.—

The same apostles, who preached the divinity of Christ, which we all believe, decreed in a council, that the Christians should abstain from the use of blood, and the flesh of strangled animals.* We believe the doctrine they preached: we overlook the discipline they established, because the prohibition was temporary. The doctrine is permanent: opinions are fugitive: laws, discipline, and decrees vary with time We are but little concerned in the transactions of the twelfth or thirteenth century. We are a new world raised on the ruins of the former, and if hitherto we could not agree as Christians, *it is high time to live together as men.* There is land enough for us all; and it is by far better to see towns and cities rearing their heads on the banks of our rivers, than to see our fertile country depopulated by intolerance. Let religion be left out of the case. Whigs and tories, Guelphes and Gibelins† may repeat the same creed, and be still divided. The French and Sicilians went to the same churches to sing their *hallelujahs* upon an Easter Sunday, when, soon after, the groans of bleeding victims began to mingle with the harmonious sound of chiming bells. The Dutch and English were Protestants, when the former massacred the latter in the island of Amboyna. Had the sufferers been of a different persuasion from that of the aggressors, religion would appear as the chief character in the two tragedies. If speculative errors be punishable, there is a day of reckoning; and eternity is long enough for retribution. But during the short span of life, chequered with so many anxious cares, let us not resemble those savages who glory in dispeopling the earth, and carrying the mangled heads of their fellow-creatures on the tops of their reeking spears, as so many trophies of their barbarous victory. In vain do we give ourselves up to hatred and vengeance: we soon discover that such cruel pleasure was never adapted to the heart of man; that in hating others we punish ourselves; that humanity disclaims violence; and that the law of God, in commanding us to love our neighbour, has consulted the most upright and reasonable dictates of the

* Acts, chap. 15.

† Two formidable factions in the time of the disputes between the popes and emperors.

human heart. The world is tired of religious disputes, and it is high time for you, Gentlemen, to be tired of me.

It is time to agree to a truce, and leave the field to such champions as are willing to engage in national and political contests, infinitely more useful to the public than the thread-spun arguments of polemical divinity, decrees of councils, or obsolete canons.

Should any of the champions of the eighty-five legions of Glasgow, or any of their allies and confederates sound the trumpet, I shall not prepare myself for battle. If I attempted to throw fanaticism into ridicule, they are welcome to discharge at me arrows reposited in the quivers of the *Spanish Friar* and the *Duenna*. Of what use is it to the public, if I have recourse to Chrysal, or, the Adventures of a Guinea, where our modern apostles are taken off in the conference between Momus and Mother Brimstone.

If the attack be serious, the weapons will be taken from the mouldering arsenals of old councils, pope's decrees, and obsolete canons. There it will be a repetition of the same thing, *for ever and for aye*, to use the words of old Robin Hood. But should Mr. Wesley, W. A. D—mm—d, or any apostle belonging to the *eighty-five societies*, intend to be of use to the public, I shall co-operate with their pious endeavours, with all the veins in my heart.

We have obtained of late the privilege of planting tobacco in Ireland, and our tobacconists want paper. Let Mr. Wesley then come with me, as the *curate* and *barber* went to *shave* and *bless* the library of Don Quixote. All the old books, old canons, sermons, and so forth, tending to kindle feuds, or promote rancour, let us fling them out at the windows. Society will lose nothing; the tobacconist will benefit by the spoils of antiquity. And if, upon mature deliberation, we decree that Mr. Wesley's Journal, and his apology for the Association's *Appeal*, should share the same fate with the old buckrams, we will procure them a gentle fall. After having rocked ourselves in the large and hospitable cradle of the Free-press, where the peer and the commoner, the priest and the alderman, the friar and swaddler, can stretch themselves at full length, provided they be not too churlish, let us laugh at those who breed useless quarrels, and set

to the world the bright example of toleration and benevolence.

A peaceable life and happy death to all Adam's children! May the ministers of religion of every denomination, whether they pray at the head of their congregations in embroidered vestments, or black gowns, short coats, grey locks, powdered wigs, or black curls, instead of inflaming the rabble, and inspiring their hearers with hatred and animosity, or their fellow creatures, recommend love, peace, and harmony!

I have the honour to be,

Gentlemen, your most affectionate,

And humble servant,

ARTHUR O'LEARY.

REJOINDER TO

MR. WESLEY'S REPLY.

THE following extract from Locke's letter on Toleration, together with Mr. Wesley's reply, has been sent to the author, with a request to answer it, IF IN HIS POWER, says the writer of the letter. Mr. Locke in a profound manner opens the gate of toleration to all mortals, who do not entertain any principals injurious to the rights of civil society: but my correspondent is surprised that such an impartial writer should make an oblique charge on the Roman Catholics, if it were not grounded on truth:—

'We cannot find any sect that teaches expressly and 'openly, that men are not obliged to keep their promise; 'that princes may be dethroned by those that differ from 'them in religion, or that the dominion of all things belongs 'only to themselves—but nevertheless we find those, that say 'the same thing in other words. What else do they mean 'who teach, that faith is not to be kept with heretics?— 'What can be the meaning of their asserting that kings, 'excommunicated, forfeit their crowns and kingdoms?— 'That dominion is founded in grace, is an assertion by which 'those that maintain it, do plainly lay a claim to the pos- 'session of all things. I say, these have no right to be tole- 'rated by the magistrate.'

Again: 'That church can have no right to be tolerated 'by the magistrate, which is constituted upon such a bottom, 'that all those who enter into it, do hereby, *ipso facto*, deli- 'ver themselves up to the protection and service of another 'prince; for by this means the magistrate would give way 'to the setting up of a foreign jurisdiction in his own coun- 'try, and suffer his own people to be enlisted, as it were, 'for soldiers against his own government. Nor does the 'frivolous and fallacious distinction between the court 'and the church, afford any remedy to this inconvenience; 'especially when both the one and the other, are equally 'subject to the absolute authority of the same person; 'who has not only power to persuade the members of his 'Church to whatever he lists, either as purely religious, or 'as in order thereunto, but also can enjoin them, on pain 'of eternal fire.

'It is ridiculous for any one to profess himself to be a 'Mahometan only in his religion; but in every thing else a

'faithful subject to a Christian magistrate, whilst at the 'same time, he acknowledges himself bound to yield blind 'obedience to the Mufti of Constantinople; who himself is 'entirely obedient to the Ottoman Emperor, and frames the 'feigned oracles of that religion according to his pleasure. 'But this Mahometan, living amongst Christians, would yet 'more apparently renounce their government, if he ac-'knowledged the same person to be the head of his church, 'who is the supreme magistrate in the state.'

Locke on Toleration, p. 59.

MR. O'LEARY'S ANSWER.

Mr. Locke's *supposed principles* are fully answered in 'Loyalty Asserted.' With every respect due to so great a man, he was as ignorant of the Catholics' creed, as any of the London rioters. 'That the dominion of all things be-'longs to the saints,' was the doctrine of Wickliff, Huss, and the English regicides in the time of Charles the First: a doctrine condemned by the Council of Constance, in the thirtieth proposition, extracted from Huss's writings.

Mr. Locke, in shutting the gates of toleration against the professors of such a doctrine, fully justifies the Emperor Sigismund in putting Huss to death: as that unhappy man not only preached, but practised it. In matters more within the verge of his knowledge, I widely differ from Mr. Locke. When he denies any innate ideas, or the least notion of a God implanted in our souls, independent of the senses, I prefer the Cartesian philosophers, Messieurs de Portroyal, the bishop of Rochester, and several others who were of a different opinion. But, when he supposes that 'the same 'person who is head of the church, is the supreme magistrate 'in the state; that the people can frame the feigned oracles 'of the Catholic religion, as the Mufti can frame them for the 'Turks, by the direction of the Ottoman Emperor; that he 'can persuade the members of his church to whatever he lists, 'and enjoin it them, on pain of eternal fire,' &c. my honest good English philosopher was either snoring, or as ignorant of the Catholic creed, as the old woman that used to bring

him his toast and ale, when he was writing on government, against Sir Robert Filmer's Patriarcha.

The universities of Paris, Valentia, Toulouse, Poictiers, Bourdeaux, Bourges, Rheims, Caen, &c. that is to say, the oracles of the doctrine taught in their respective countries, knew their creed better than an English philosopher could teach them. They have stigmatized those assertions obtruded on the public by Mr. Locke; and, in the condemnation of Santorellus, who asserted that the Pope could depose kings guilty of *heresy*, qualify his doctrine as 'new, 'false, erroneous, contrary to the word of God, calculated 'to bring an odium on the see of Rome, to impair the 'supreme civil authority that depends on God alone, and 'to disturb the public tranquility.'

Such is the doctrine of Catholics; and had Mr. Locke read history, or been candid enough to acknowledge it, he would have found the practice of the Catholics, in all ages, conformable to the decision.

'The Pope can persuade the members of his church to 'what he lists, and enjoin it them, on pain of eternal 'fire.'—Doubtless! he can *persuade* me to kill my mother, and enjoin it me, on *pain of fire*. He can *persuade* me that I eat my victuals with the big toe of my left foot; or that John Locke's mother was a virgin, when she was delivered of the author of the 'Essay on Human Understanding.'

Still the Pope could not persuade the English Catholics to give their benefices to Italian incumbents, in the time of Richard the Second, nor dissuade a Catholic parliament from introducing the premunire, against provisions obtained at the court of Rome; an evident proof that they knew the distinction between the church and the court. Pope Boniface VIII. could not persuade the Catholics of his time to believe that he was lord paramount of all the kingdoms of the earth; nor dissuade the king of France from writing the following letter to him: 'We would have your Madness know, that 'we acknowledge no superior in temporals but God alone.'

Pius the Fifth, and Sixtus Quintus, in publishing their bulls of deposition against queen Elizabeth,* and absolving

* Such proceedings are accounted for in Loyalty Asserted, in the discussion of the deposing power.

her subjects from their allegiance, could not persuade the Catholics of England to rise up in arms against their sovereign, though they were superior in numbers, and had room to expect every assistance.

Two proofs which will ever stand upon record, that Catholics never hold difference in religion, as a sufficient plea for dethroning kings; nor a Pope's bull a sufficient cause for withdrawing their allegiance.

In the dark ages, Popes were deposed by the Council of Constance; and John the Twenty-second, who preached up the Millenarian doctrine, and held that souls do not enjoy the clear sight of God until after the resurrection, could not persuade the members of his church to believe him: nor dissuade the university of Paris from censuring a doctrine, which the head of their church preached from the pulpit at Avignon, and which he himself retracted before a notary public, and several witnesses in his last sickness; nor dissuade a French king from writing this short letter to him, '*Retracte, ou je te ferai ardre*'—retract, or I will get you burned. An evident proof that the Pope cannot 'persuade 'the members of his church, to what he lists, nor enjoin it 'them on pain of eternal fire.'

For the honour of Locke's memory, let my correspondent throw the fifty-ninth page of his treatise on toleration into the fire, for it is a jumble of nonsense.

All the Popes' bulls from the time of St. Peter, to the end of ages, cannot make an article of faith for Roman Catholics, without the acceptance of the Universal Church; and the church has no power over the temporals of kings, much less to command any thing against the laws of God.

Catholics never follow an arbitrary doctrine. The standard is fixed; the boundaries are prescribed, and the Pope himself cannot remove them: they consider him as the head pastor of the church.—Subordination in every society, requires pre-eminence in its rulers: but his will is not their creed.

As to Mr. Wesley, his reply to me is little more than a repetition of his first letter. He denies 'that he himself, or 'his followers, were ever persecuted.' For the truth I appeal

to his own conscience: I appeal to his 'Farther Appeal' to men of reason and religion, wherein he describes the sufferings of several of his followers in England; how he himself was dragged by the mob; and the proceedings of a magistrate who dispersed a pamphlet, entitled '*A parallel between the Papists and Methodists*,' in order to kindle the rage of the populace against him. I appeal to the letter he wrote, many years ago, to doctor Bailey of Cork, wherein he complains that the Grand Jury of that city found indictments against Charles Wesley, who makes the hymns, and ordered him to be transported as a vagabond. Mr. Wesley has got the letter printed, with the names of the Grand Jury. But, after having weathered the storm, the mariner on shore forgets his distresses as well as his sea chart.

To show that his friend, John Huss, never 'kindled any 'civil wars in Bohemia, and that he was quite innocent of 'any offence whatever,' he quotes the following testimonial, given to John Huss, by the bishop of Nazareth, 'We, Nicho-'las, do, by these presents, make known unto all men, that 'we often talked with that honourable man, John Huss, and 'in all his sayings, doings, and behaviour, have found him 'to be a faithful man; finding no manner of evil, sinister 'or erroneous doings in him, unto these presents.' To this Mr. Wesley subjoins a testimonial from the archbishop of Prague, declaring, 'that he knew not that John 'Huss was culpable or faulty in any crime or offence what-'soever.'

Let us now suppose those testimonials to be genuine, and grant them to Mr. Wesley to get rid of a bad cause. What advantage can he derive from them? The bishop of Nazareth declares, that he *talked* very often with John Huss, and that in their conversation, he discovered nothing sinister or erroneous in him. Doubtless, in conversing with a bishop who was an Inquisitor, John Huss was upon his guard. The archbishop 'knew not that he was culpable.' The conversation of the first, and the *know not* of the other, must counterbalance the positive and decisive proofs, produced on a criminal's trial, in presence of a general council, no ways interested in the condemnation of a man, in whom there 'was 'no evil, nothing sinister or erroneous.' Testimonials are

often granted to people from tenderness, or ignorance, which will avail but little on a trial.

The thirtieth proposition, extracted from Huss's works, and condemned by the Council, runs thus: 'there is no tem-' poral Lord, there is no Pope, no Bishop, when he is in the ' state of mortal sin.' Huss himself acknowledged this seditious proposition, which authorizes the fanatical saint to take the king's crown, if he sees him but once drunk; or to seize the property of the lord of the manor, if, in scolding his coachman, he curses. The fruits of this doctrine were as visible in Bohemia, as the fruits of Mr. Wesley's Apology for the Associations, are legible in the glowing embers of London.

L'Enfant, the Calvinist historian of the Council of Constance, better informed than Mr. Wesley, can instruct him in these words: 'John Huss, by his sermons and writings, ' and violent and outrageous conduct, had extremely con-' tributed to the troubles which then distracted Bohe-' mia.'*

What becomes now of testimonials which carry contradiction on the very face of them, whereas John Huss was excommunicated a year and a half before he obtained them? Those Bishops, then, must have been mistaken if their testimonials be genuine. Each of them must have been the Burnet of his days; of whom Protestant as well as Catholic historians remark, that he is never to be believed less, than when he relates facts, of which he pretends to have been an ocular witness.

Mr. Wesley denies that 'John Huss ever attempted to ' make his escape.' He may deny his own journals. Dacher and Reichenthal, two German historians, present at the Council, and on whom L'Enfant passes the highest encomiums for candour and integrity, relate that John Huss attempted to make his escape. Here he violated his safe-conduct, and forced his judges to confine him. L'Enfant exhausts his wit, to invalidate the relation of those (according to himself,) 'unprejudiced historians.' His chief reasons are 'the ' silence of the acts of the Council about Huss's flight.' To this it is answered, that in the acts of a Council, the judi-

* L'Enfant, B. 3. No.

cial acts done in full council, are alone related; not every incident that happens in a city where it is held. Hence Huss's imprisonment is not mentioned. Jerome of Prague's flight is mentioned, because the council sent him a safe-conduct, and the cause required to be specified. Secondly, he says that, 'it appears that John Huss was apprehended 'on the twenty-eighth of November, and consequently could 'not escape in the following March.' Besides other reasons it can be answered that the mistake of a date, (often owing to the fault of copyers or printers,) cannot invalidate the truth of a public fact attested by such ocular witnesses, as L'Enfant describes the two German historians to have been.

But Mr. Wesley insists, that 'the Emperor Sigismund 'granted Huss a safe-conduct, promising him impunity, in 'case he was found guilty.' I explained the nature of safe-conducts, in my Remarks on that gentleman's letters; and I insist that safe-conducts of the kind are never granted. It is enough for sovereigns to extend the mercy of prerogative to criminals, when they are found guilty by their judges, without saying to a rebel, or an incendiary, or to a highwayman: 'go and take your trial: never fear: I will grant you your 'pardon, when you are found guilty, though I am convinced 'you are an arrant rogue.' They never enter into compacts of the kind with such people. A man who is to take his trial, and his enemies in the way, may call for a safe-conduct to go to the place of trial, and return unmolested, if he is acquitted; and this was the case of Huss. He offered of himself to take his trial, and to submit to the sentence, if found guilty. He never upbraided the emperor with his breach of promise, when he was given up to the secular arm; which he would have done, had the emperor given him such an assurance. The Hussites themselves went, on the faith of a safe-conduct, to the Council of Basil, and never alleged breach of faith with John Huss.

It was, then, in the sixteenth century, when interested men fomented divisions between Catholics and Protestants, that the hand of calumny wrote false commentaries on the text of the canon of the Council of Constance; and handed it down as a theme to religious declaimers, whom the test of

orthodoxy proposed by the very Council, *will ever stare in the face.*

Here is the test inserted in a bull published with the approbation of a general Council, not by the Pope in his personal capacity, but *sacro approbante Concilio.* 'Let the 'person suspected be asked, whether he or she does not 'think that all wilful perjury, committed upon any occa- 'sion whatsoever, for the preservation of one's life, or 'another man's, or even for the sake of the faith, is a mor- 'tal sin?'

I have read near upon a thousand religious declamations against Popery; not one of the authors of those invectives has candour or honour to produce that test in favour of Catholics; which shews the spirit that actuates them They should, at least, imitate the limner who first painted Pope's Essay on Man, and contrasted, on the same canvass, the blooming cheek with the frightful skeleton, linked together in the same group. No, they will paint the Catholic religion in profile, and fix a Saracen's cheek into the face of the Christian. The declaration of a general Council, which can afford the least occasion for cavil, will be eternally held forth, whilst the decrees of the same Council, liable to no misconstruction, where fraud and perjury, even for the sake of religion, are condemned, will be overlooked. Bellarmin, Becanus, and those other Knoxes and Buchanans of the Catholic religion, whose works are burned by the hands of the executioner in Catholic countries, are dragged from their shelves, whilst the decisions of the most learned universities in the world, that condemned the false doctrine of those incendiaries, are buried in silence. The bee pitches on flowers, but the beetle falls upon nuisances.

They will be eternally teasing their hearers and readers with the word *heretic*, without explaining its sense or acceptation. They will erect it as a kind of standard to which all the fanatics of the world will flock to fight the battles of the Lord against Antichrist; and in this confederate army, they will confound the archbishop of Cashel, who fills his see after a long succession of Protestant bishops, with John Huss, who starts up on a sudden, flying in the faces of kings and

bishops. They will confound the bishop of Cork with Theodorus Sartor, stretching himself naked before a number of prophets and prophetesses, who burn their clothes, and run naked through the streets of Amsterdam, denouncing their woes, and foretelling the destruction of Antichrist. They will put the archbishop of Canterbury on a level with the Patarini, who exclaimed against Popery, and held that no sin could be committed with the lower parts of the body.

In fine, all those monsters that started up from time to time, and whom our magistrates would doom to the rope or fagot, are made good Protestants, because they exclaimed against Popery; an enumeration of their sufferings from Papists, is enlarged upon: and the Protestant bishop, or the Protestant king, has no mercy to expect from Papists: for sure they are held in the same light, by them, with James Nailer, who, after fighting against Papists and Malignants, in Cromwell's army, turned prophet, and rode into Bristol, mounted on an ass, on a Palm Sunday, attended with numbers of women, spreading their aprons before him, and making the air re-echo to loud hosannahs: 'Holy, holy, 'holy, hosannah to James Nailer; blessed is James Nailer, 'who comes in the name of the Lord!'* Those gentlemen never mention heretics excommunicated by Protestant churches, and put to death by Protestant magistrates. They never mention the description given of heretics by Protestant writers; by Godolphin, the Protestant canonist, and Sir Edward Coke, the Protestant lawyer, who both call heresy, '*leprum animæ*.'—the leprosy of the soul. No, heresy is the Papist's favourite theme. No Protestant ever made any commentaries on it.

The same uncandid fallacy that lurks under the word *heretic*, with which the Catholics are always taunted, is manifest in the strained construction of the canon of the Council of Constance. A spiritual cause is to be tried by ecclesiastical judges. They declare that 'no safe-conduct granted by 'princes, shall hinder heretics from being judged and pu-'nished.' (with ecclesiastical censures and degradation, for their power to punish can extend no farther) 'and that when

* Swell's Life of James Nailer.

'the person who has promised them security' (from this ecclesiastical punishment, for no other can be meant by a spiritual tribunal), 'has done all that is in his power to do, 'shall not in this case,' (the case of securing from a spiritual or ecclesiastical punishment inflicted by a lawful superior,) 'be obliged to keep his promise:' because a promise of the kind, made to one of their rebellious clergymen, who corrupts and falsifies their doctrine, is an unjust usurpation of their rights, and subversive of their spiritual jurisdiction.—And an unjust promise, injurious to the rights of another, is not binding, let the tie be what it will. Herod promised upon oath to give his daughter whatever she would ask for. He was not bound to give her the head of John the Baptist. If the king of England, without even depriving a single man of his estate, bound himself by oath, to arrogate to himself the legislative as well as the executive power; every antagonist of Popery, from the Prelate down to the tub-preacher, would cry out, with the fathers of the Council of Constance: 'He is not, in this case, obliged to keep his promise.'

In this sense, the canon of the Council is to be understood. In this sense, the fathers themselves, the best interpreters of their own meaning, understand it. In this sense the Catholic doctors, all over the world, understand it; they who are more competent judges of their own creed, than either Mr. Locke or Mr. Wesley. Such of them as are of opinion, that the supreme power of the state can make heresy a capital crime, rise up with indignation against the false accusers who say that the Council authorised breach of faith with heretics. They write in Catholic states where they have nothing to fear, and less to expect, from Mr. Wesley and his London rioters.

If Mr. Wesley construes this canon in a different sense, it is no reason for obtruding his tortured construction on me, as an article of orthodoxy. An Arian may as well persuade the public, that I do not believe the Divinity of Christ, because he does not believe in it himself, and tortures the Scriptures in support of his errors. John Huss was a priest, ordained in the Church of Rome, and said mass until the day of his confinement. I suppose Mr. Wesley will not allow, that a temporal prince could deprive his spiritual superiors

from censuring and degrading him, if found guilty of an erroneous doctrine.

Every church claims to herself the power of inflicting spiritual punishments, independent of the magistrates. The church of Rome, the consistories of Scotland, and all others. When the council of two hundred arrogated to themselves the power of denouncing and absolving from censures, and in consequence intended to absolve one Bertelier, Calvin ascended the pulpit, and, with outstretched hands, threatened to oppose force to force; exclaimed with vehemence of voice against the profanation, and forced the senate to resign their spiritual commission. Bertelier was punished in spite of the promise of the civil power. When Mr. Wesley refused the sacrament to Mrs. Williamson, in Georgia, for opposing the propagation of the Gospel, in giving the preference to Mr. Williamson, the layman, at a time when the clergyman intended to light Hymen's torch with a *spark of grace;* a conflict of jurisdiction between the clergy and laity was the result; Mr. Wesley was indicted; and the following warrant, copied by himself into his journal, was issued:

"GEORGIA. SAVANNAH. ff.

"*To all Constables, Tything Men, and others whom these may*
"*concern.*

"You and each of you are hereby required to take the "body of John Wesley, clerk, &c. &c. &c.

(Signed) "TH. CHRISTIE."

'Tuesday, the ninth,' says Mr. Wesley, 'Mr. Jones, the 'constable, carried me before Mr. Bailiff Parker and Mr. 'Recorder. My answer to them was—that the giving or 'refusing the Lord's supper being a matter purely ecclesi-'astic, I could not acknowledge their power to interrogate 'me upon it.'* If Mr. Wesley, then, thought himself justifiable in pleading the clerical privilege, let him not blame the fathers of Constance, for declaring their right to punish with ecclesiastical censures and degradation, one of their own subjects, in spite of any safe-conduct granted by the

* See this whole affair in Mr. Wesley's Journal of the year 1737, p. 43.

civil power; especially at a time when the superiority over their own clergy was confirmed to the bishops by the laws of the empire, with which Sigismund could no more dispense at that time, than James the Second could in his.

'But,' says Mr. Wesley, 'sure Huss would not have come 'to Constance, had he foreseen the consequence.' That regarded himself. Obstinate persons seldom think themselves in error. Strange instances of this obstinacy can be met with in the trials of the Regicides; some of whom declared, at the hour of death, that they gloried in having a hand in the king's death, and would cheerfully play over the same tragedy. We have a more recent instance of this obstinacy, in one of Mr. Wesley's martyrs. Scarcely could the Protestant clergyman prevail on one of the rioters, who had been very active in plundering the city of London, to take the blue cockade out of his hat, in going to the gallows. He cried out that he died a martyr to the Protestant religion.—We have daily instances of people giving themselves up to take their trial, who are disappointed, without any imputation on their judges.

Jerome of Prague, who maintained the same error with Huss, came to Constance, after his confrere's execution.—The Council sent him a safe-conduct, with this express clause: '*salvo jure concilii;*' reserving to the Council its right to judge you. He came: and the Council judged and punished him with degradation, as it had done with regard to Huss: and left him to the secular arm: as Calvin, Queen Elizabeth, and King James I. did to the heretics whom their consistories and bishops had judged and found guilty of *heretical pravity*. 'But was not the Emperor Sigismund cruel in putting 'those men to death?' It is not his lenity or cruelty that we examine: I only vindicate myself and the Catholic Church from a slanderous doctrine. He was not more cruel for putting seditious men, one of whom had committed wilful murder, to death, than Protestant sovereigns who doomed old women to the stake, for a kind of gibberish about the incarnation. My sentiments on that subject I have explained.

Jerome of Prague's coming to the Council, shews that it did not violate faith with John Huss. Neither doth any one

accuse the Council of violating faith with Jerome. They were both more obstinate than Mr. Wesley, who ran away from the bailiffs of Georgia, and would not return to them. In this he followed Sancho's maxim: '*Many go to the* '*market for wool, that come home shorn.*'

I have the honour to be,

Gentlemen, your most affectionate,

And humble servant,

ARTHUR O'LEARY.

AN

ESSAY ON TOLERATION.

MR. O'LEARY'S PLEA FOR

LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.

THE INTRODUCTION.

My design, in the following sheets, is, to throw open the gates of civil toleration for all Adam's children, whose principles are not inconsistent with the peace of civil society, or subversive of the rules of morality; to wrench, as far as in my power lies, the poniard so often tinged with human blood, from the hand of persecution; to sheath the sword, which misguided zeal has drawn in defence of a Gospel which recommends peace and love; to restore to man the indelible charter of his temporal rights, which no earthly power has ever been commissioned by Heaven to deprive him of, on account of his mental errors, to re-establish the empire of peace, overthrown so often by religious feuds; and to cement all mortals, especially Christians, in the ties of social harmony, by establishing toleration on its proper grounds.

The history of the calamities occasioned by difference in religious opinions, is a sufficient plea for undertaking the task. But time does not allow me to enter into a detail of those melancholy scenes, which misconstrued religion has displayed. The effects are well known: but it is high time to remove the cause.

The mind shrinks back at the thoughts of the cruelties exercised against the Christians by Heathen Emperors, for the space of three hundred years. Scarce did the Christians begin to breathe, under the first princes who embraced their religion, than they fell out amongst themselves, about the mysteries of the Scriptures. Arianism, protected by powerful sovereigns, raised, against the defenders of the Trinity, persecutions as violent as those raised formerly by the Hea-

thens. Since that time, at different intervals, error, backed by power, persecuted truth. And the partizans of truth, forgetful of the moderation which reason and religion prescribe, committed the same excesses with which they upbraided their oppressors. Sovereigns blinded by dangerous zeal,—or guided by barbarous policy,—or seduced by odious councils,—became the executioners of their subjects who adopted religious systems different from those of their rulers; or persevered in ancient systems, from which their sovereigns had receded.

Had those horrors been confined to one sect of Christians only, infidels would not have been so successful in their attacks on the system at large; though religion disclaims the odious imputation. But all sects execrated and attempted to extirpate one another. Europe became one wild altar, on which every religious sect offered up human victims to its creed.

The ministers of a religion that had triumphed over the Cæsars, not by resistance, but by suffering, became the apologists of calamities that swept from the face of the earth, or oppress to this very day, God's noblest images—upright, virtuous, and dauntless men. Like the warrior in the scriptures, they stept into the sanctuary, to grasp the barbarian's sword wrapt up in the ephod. The code of temporal laws, teeming with sanctions against robbers and murderers, was swelled, to the surprise and destruction of mankind, with additional decrees against *heretics* and *Papists*. The inoffensive citizen who, from an apprehension of offending the Deity, by acting against his conscience, was confined in the same dungeon, or doomed to the fagot or axe, with the parricide who laid aside every restraint of moral obligation: and the scriptures were adduced in justification of the sanguinary confusion. The wreath and the rod have been held forth, not to crown the worthy, and punish the pernicious, but to scourge to conformity, candid and steady virtue. The priest gave the sanction of Heaven to the bloody mandates of the civil magistrate: and the civil magistrate unsheathed the sword to vindicate the cause of the God of Heaven, who reserves to himself the punishment of man's conscience. No person has a greater respect for the clerical order, of every

denomination, than I have. I am of the number, and feel myself wounded through their sides, when the Deist and free-thinker, who hold them all in equal contempt, contend 'that in all ages, and in all countries, the clergy are the 'main props of persecution. That had they been as solici-'tous to heal, and conciliate men's hearts, as they have been 'to inflame and divide them, the world would by this time 'bear a different aspect. That they should have left the laity 'in peaceable possession of good neighbourhood, mutual 'charity, and friendly confidence. That instead of enforcing 'the great principles of religion, the very basis whereof is 'charity, peace, and love, they are ever and always the first 'oppressors of those who differ from them in opinion; and 'the active and impelling spring that gives force and elasti-'city to the destructive weapons of the civil power.' In corroboration of the charge, the free-thinker will unfold the page of history, and open those enormous volumes, made up of religious declamation. He will prove from both, that if 'popes, and their apologists, have scattered the fire-brand, 'their spiritual brethren have faithfully copied their example, 'in succeeding times, wherever their power and influence 'prevailed.'

'Though the Protestant divines,' says Hume, 'had ven-'tured to renounce opinions, deemed certain for so many 'ages, they regarded in their turn, the new system so cer-'tain, that they could bear no contradiction with regard to 'it: and they were ready to burn in the same flames, from 'which they themselves had so narrowly escaped, every one 'that had the assurance to oppose them.'* Hence the scaffolds reeking in Holland with the blood of many illustrious men, who, after opposing Philip the Second's efforts to introduce conformity by fire and sword, fell themselves by the hand of the executioner, for denying Gomar's predestination. Hence hecatombs of victims offered upon the gloomy altar of the Scotch league and covenant, and peopling the regions of the dead, for differing in opinion. 'Out of 'every contested verse,' says the satirical Voltaire, 'there 'issued fury armed with a quibble and a poniard, who in-'spired mankind at once with folly and cruelty.'

* Hume's History of England, Vol. 4. p. 161.

The same demon that poured the poisonous cup over the kingdoms and provinces of Europe, took his flight over the Atlantic, and spread his baneful influence amongst colonists who had themselves fled from the scourge. Their new built cities, like so many Jerusalems, were purified from idolatry. There no Popish priest dared bend his knee to 'his idols, or transfer to stock or stone, the 'worship due to the God of Israel.' There the Quaker-woman's silent groans were raised on the high key of loud shrieks, when the Lord's deputy ordered her profane breasts to be whipt off by the Gospel scourge, that whipped the profaners out of the temple. There the Quaker was seen, suspended by the neck on high, for daring to pollute the sacred streets with his profane feet, *moved by Baal's spirit.* The holy city,* thus purged from the Jebuseans, and Pheriseans, was split soon after into two factions. The two famous covenants, the covenant of grace, and the covenant of works, soon divided the spiritual militants. The jarring of divinity caused such dissensions, that in the presence of sixty thousand savages, headed by their warriors, giving the signal for scaling the walls, to bury the contending parties under their ruins, grace would not permit works to lend the least assistance for repelling the common foe. It became victorious over the Indians and Christians. It drove the first from its walls, and banished the latter from the city into savannahs and deserts, to procure themselves subsistence by the works of their hands.

In a word, persecution on the score of our conscience, has thinned the world of fifty millions of human beings, by fire and sword. Thousands, who have escaped the sword and fagot, have perished, and are daily perishing with hunger and want, for their mode of worship. The London riots, occasioned by a pretext of religion, have added about four hundred more, deluded by religious frenzy, to the enormous number. And though they suffered as plunderers and incendiaries, yet religious intolerance in their leaders, occasioned the deluded people's destruction.

The history of the calamities, occasioned by the gospel of

* See the History of Massachusets Bay, or Boston.

peace, could be concluded with the poet's Epiphonema.—'*Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum.*' 'Such devilish 'acts religion could persuade!'*

The Quakers, to their eternal credit, and to the honour of humanity, are the only persons who have exhibited a meekness and forbearance, worthy the imitation of those who have entered into a covenant of mercy by their baptism.—William Penn, the great legislator of that people, had the success of a conqueror in establishing and defending his colony amongst savage tribes, without ever drawing the sword; the goodness of the most benevolent rulers, in treating his subjects as his own children; and the tenderness of a universal father, who opened his arms to all mankind, without distinction of sect or party, In his republic, it was not the religious creed, but personal merit that entitled every member of society, to the protection and emoluments of the state. Rise from your grave, great man! and teach those sovereigns who make their subjects miserable, on account of their catechisms, the method of making them happy. They, whose dominions resemble enormous prisons, where one part of the creation are distressed captives, and the other their unpitying keepers.

I shall examine the charter which is pleaded in justification of restraints on the score of conscience. The Protestant and Catholic are equally concerned in the discussion. Each would plead for toleration in his turn; and the honour of religion, should be vindicated from the imputation of enormities, which should be transferred to their real principles—I mean the passions of men, or their ignorance of the limits which religion itself prescribes to their power. I know the difficulty there lies in encountering prejudices which have a long prescription to plead. I shall be asked whether I am ignorant of the rescripts of Popes inserting in the directory of the inquisition the imperial constitutions, dooming heretics to the flames; the authority of Catholic and Protestant canonists, divines, and Civilians, Calvin, Bellarmin, Gomar, benches of Protestant bishops, who gave their votes for enacting the law that doomed myself to transportation,

* Creech's Lucretius.

and to death if ever I return to my native country; though I am conscious of no crime against the state, but that crime of a legal creation, viz. *saying my prayers whilst others are cursing!* Am I ignorant of the practice of ages, which has given a sanction of fines, forfeitures, imprisonments, and death itself, on the score of religion? A practice, supported by the most learned writers of every denomination, and legible in bloody characters in the annals of Protestant states, as well as in the registers of the inquisition? I answer, that I am not ignorant of the sanguinary rubric that first taught the manner of preparing the human victim for the altar of religion, in honour of a God, who instead of requiring such a sacrifice, died on the cross for his creatures, and with expanded arms prayed for his enemies: Neither am I ignorant of the gloomy ritual, substituted in certain kingdoms in the place of the fagot, and which prescribes the manner of stripping the man, in honour of a gospel, which commands to clothe the naked. They must both come under the same description. For if religion authorises to deprive a man of the means of supporting life, and providing for the education of his children, and the maintenance of his family; the same religion authorises to deprive him of life itself. Religion is alleged on both sides, and as the degree of punishment is arbitrary, and lies at the discretion of the legislator, he can extend, or reduce it to what compass he thinks fit; and it is well known that a speedy death is preferable to a tedious agony.

But what if I oppose practice to practice; pope to pope; doctor to doctor? Without a cardinal's robe, or a bishop's rochet, what if my arguments in favour of the rights of mankind, should outweigh the reasoning of the purpled or mitred apologists of its oppressors? What if my authorities should prove more numerous and illustrious than theirs? What if I should happen to demonstrate, that when they allege religion as a sufficient motive for the exertion of oppressive power, in such an age, or in such a country; it must be the religion of time, or place, but not the religion of the gospel. '*Fides temporum, non evangeliorum.*'

Cartesius, in a stove, by remarking the motion of the smoke that rolled from his pipe, gave the first shock to Aristotle's barbarous philosophy, that kept the world in ignorance for so many ages. Succeeding geniuses improved upon the new plan; until at last Sir Isaac Newton dispelled the mist, and made the light shine forth in its full lustre. I in my cell, reflecting on the revolutions that religion has occasioned, not for the good, but for the destruction of mankind—revolutions in their morals, by inspiring them with mutual hatred and aversion, by making them believe that they were dispensed with the unchangeable laws of love and humanity, and deluding them into a persuasion, that the death or oppression of a fellow-creature on account of his error, was an agreeable sacrifice to the Divinity—I also, by a feeble attempt to overthrow the altars of an idol, that has put Jesus Christ on a level with Moloch, and whose false oracles persuaded mankind, that the ears of a God of compassion and tenderness, were pleased with the groans of victims tied to the stake, or famishing in dungeons, or hovels, —may induce others to enlist under the banner of benevolence, and pave the way for abler hands to raise the structure of human happiness, on the ruins of religious frenzy.

Locke has handled the subject as a profound philosopher; Voltaire as a partial satirist in a declamatory style, more with the view to censure the scriptures, than to establish it on its proper grounds: I am confined to the province of a divine, and in that quality shall arraign at the bar of religion itself, the calamities to which the mistakes, or passions of men, have given rise, under pretence of vindicating the Deity. The bigot will consider me as a latitudinarian, to whom all religions are indifferent; and as one who writes in such a manner, as dispense men with the obligations of submitting to the church. He is mistaken: I am not an architect who would build the edifice of my faith on different plans; nor an ambassador who would sign two contradictory treaties in my legation. Every person is bound to enquire after the truth, and when he finds it, to embrace its dictates. If he neglected it, let the blame lie at his own door. Let charity and zeal induce his neighbour to instruct, and

persuade him, when there is a probability of reclaiming him from error. But let not violence, oppression, and wanton insults be used in order to compel him. God has given him free will, and liberty of chusing either fire or water. The sanguinary divines, who think it lawful in the supreme magistrate to inflict a capital punishment, on misguided religionists, (for they do not allow one individual to kill or oppress another, on account of difference of religion) acknowledge that heretical and idolatrous kings, should not be deposed or killed, by their Christian or orthodox subject; because, say they, 'dominion is not founded in grace, but in free will.'

I would fain know, by what right Christian, idolatrous, or orthodox kings, can deprive their heathen, Christian, heretical, or orthodox subjects of their lives or properties, on account of their mental errors. *But the scripture commands to obey kings in what is lawful:* and where does it command kings to kill or oppress their subjects? When it recommends justice and mercy to the rulers of the earth, does it make any distinction between their heathen, heretical, or orthodox subjects? The church disclaims the right of the sword, and the use of fines and confiscations to promote her spiritual ends. The civil powers are not competent judges of speculative errors. How come people then, to be oppressed between the civil powers, and the established church in any state? If it be answered, that the established church in any state, can exercise the right of the sword, not by herself but by her magistrate. The death then of the criminal, must entirely lie at the hangman's door; and the judge who passed a final doom on him has no share in the execution. Away then, for ever, with the odious and fallacious distinction.

Are the Catholic and Protestant princes of Germany, who have granted a free exercise of their religion, to all their subjects, worse Christians than the Catholic and Protestant princes of barbarous times, who were their subjects' executioners? The Catholics and Protestants, who say their prayers in the same church, in that tolerating country, are they worse Christians, than the Catholics and Protestants whom Henry the Eighth used to couple together, on

the same hurdle, and order to the place of execution? Or is the Church that sees her children receive the sacraments at the rails of the sanctuary, wherein the Protestant minister, and the Catholic priest officiate by turns, less enlightened and less tenacious of her doctrine, than she was in the time of Pope Innocent the Third? Death, fines, and confiscations, then, on the score of conscience, when the religionists behaves as a peaceable subject, are the ungraceful offspring of lawless rule. Tyranny begot it: ignorance fostered it: and barbarous divines have clothed it with the *stolen* garments of religion.

STATE OF THE CASE.

Has the supreme power in any state, a right to vindicate the Deity, by fines, forfeitures, confiscations, oppression, or the death of men, whose only crime is an erroneous religion, which does not disturb the peace of society, whether they be Jews, Mahometans, Christians, heretics or Catholics, provided they believe a supreme Being, and rewards and punishments in a future state; for all people exclude from civil toleration, those who confound vice and virtue in the horrors of the grave. Because the links of the society are dissolved, when vice loses its horror, and virtue its attractions: when the heart is steeled against the fear of an invisible Judge, and the conscience is unshackled from its bonds?

Answered in the negative. For life, liberty, the power to accumulate a fortune by honest means, &c. are rights founded in nature: and the rights of nature are not reversed by the religion founded by Him, who declares, that he came not to destroy but to save. Much less can they be reversed by civil rulers, who are born like other men, and who would not be distinguished above the crowd, were it not for the social compact, by which they bound themselves to protect those rights, and preserve them inviolate. If they

do otherwise, as often they have done, and do to this very day, it is by a stretch of power, not by the rule of right; and their only plea is that mentioned in Tacitus, '*Id enim ast æquius* '*quod est fortius.*'

From the earliest ages the boundaries of religion, and the concerns of the civil magistrate were kept distinct. If in the Jewish theocracy alone, they happened to be interwoven, and that a secession from the established religion was made capital; it was by a special commission from God, which Jesus Christ repealed in the new law, as we shall hereafter prove. Scattered tribes, before they subjected themselves to civil institutions, believed in God, at whose hands they expected the rewards of their virtues, and dreaded the punishment of their misdeeds.

Religion, and conscience, its immediate interpreter, were anterior to society, and altars reeked with the gore of victims, before the block was dyed with the blood of malefactors, spilled by the sword of the stern magistrate.

For his security and defence, man, on entering into society, gave up part of his liberty to dispose of his actions, his acquisitions, his time, which in the state of nature were at his own disposal. But he could never give up his way of thinking, or submit the dictates of his conscience, to the magistrate's controul. It is an interior monitor, whose voice cannot be silenced by human laws, and which our very passions, our inclinations, our temporal interest, can seldom bribe, how prone soever we may be to the collusive compact. Hear this, O ye rulers of the earth! Usurp no authority over God's inheritance. He alone can water and fertilize it with his grace, or from a hidden judgment, not cognizable by an earthly tribunal, strike it with barrenness and sterility. In this life you have power to kill, or to save the body: but leave the soul of man to the God who gave it. Call to mind that you must be regulated by justice. Illustrious culprits, whose authority screens you from the rigour of human laws, if you violate the sacred rules of order, you are also to be judged. The splendour that surrounds you made the prophet cry out, Ye are gods, and sons of the Most High; but he afterwards eclipses this splendour with the vale of death, ye also must die. Let not bleeding victims, and famished ob-

jects, for the sake of religion, which the rulers of the earth are the last to observe in their morals, be presented to you by your judge, who will call for your commission, and confront you with the works of your hands. The authority with which you are invested is delegated by the people, and while you enjoy it, you claim the sanction of Heaven. But neither Heaven nor man has granted you a power to punish any but malefactors. And no man is less liable to the imputation, than one who follows the dictates of his conscience. To him it is the oracle of the Divinity. In abiding by its dictates, he imagines to please his Creator. An intention to please God is no crime. Mistaken he may be; but every mistaken man is not a malefactor or cheat.

If in a wanton fit of cruelty, you imitated those African kings, who leaping into their saddles, cut off their squires' heads with one blow, to display their dexterity; or that Turkish Emperor, who, to show the limner his mistake in painting the decollation of John the Baptist, called for a slave, and striking off his head, compared it with the picture; saying to the painter, you see by this head, that the veins in that picture are not sufficiently shrivelled——would your power screen you from the guilt of murder? If I am doomed to the stake, or deprived of my horse, for not swearing to what I do not believe, the laws will justify the informer and executioner, who will say: 'the laws of your governors have 'so decreed.' It is, then, incumbent on governors to examine how far God will justify themselves. Nor is it a sufficient plea, that such laws were made by others, when it is by their own authority, they are put in execution. It is equal to the individual who is deprived of his life or his property, whether it be by the highwayman or the officer of justice, when life or property falls a sacrifice to the integrity of his conscience.

God rejects a homage which the heart belies: and woe to the conscience liable to the magistrate's controul. It would be no longer the impregnable fortress that should never surrender, but on conviction that such is the will of his Master. It would be the ductile wax, on which every new impression would erase the former, and resume it by turns. It would

believe the real presence in Rome and Upsal. It would deny it in Geneva and Edinburgh. In Paris, it would hope for an empyreal heaven, and joys spiritual and unspeakable, through the merits of Christ, in a future state; an earthly paradise and a seraglio of women, amongst never-fading bowers, if it worshipped the great Alla, and Mahomet his prophet, in Constantinople. It would worship a living man in Tartary, and evil genii in Africa. An evident proof that God has never granted any controul to kings or governors, over the conscience of man; and that it must be left to itself, and to the grace of him who gave it.

For, in every kingdom and government, the magistrates would claim the same power. Every one of them believes himself in the right; and should all of them be in the right, I am still in the wrong, when I act against my own conscience; instead of making a sincere convert, they will only make a perjured impostor of me. Hence, the wise Theodoric and other monarchs would never confer any extraordinary privileges on those who conformed to their religion. When one of his courtiers embraced Arianism, (that king's religion,) 'how could you have me trust you,' said the monarch, 'you, who betray your conscience and Christ whom 'you have worshipped from your early days?' He preferred steady virtue, blended with what he deemed error, to deceitful hypocrisy, resuming the mask of truth; and never considered a man's religion as a sufficient plea for excluding him from the rights of a subject.

Must, then, a magistrate be quite indifferent about his religion? Must he see it insulted? Must he see error spread, and stand by as a neutral spectator?

By no means: if he be convinced of the truth of his religion, far from being indifferent about it, his duty is to practise it. And no religion, established by the laws of any state, be it ever so false, is to be insulted. It would be equally indecent and ridiculous in a Christian missionary, to cry out in the streets of Constantinople, 'Mahomet is a devilish impostor.' He would not succeed so well as that Scotchman who went to Rome in order to convert Pope Ganganelli. In all appearance, he studied the revelations well, and found out the number of the beast, as well as the year of his downfall.

Accoutred with his bible, and sure of success, he sets off for Rome; and, meeting the Pope in St. Peter's Church, cries out with a loud voice: 'Rome is the scarlet whore; 'and you are the Antichrist. *Gang awa* for Scotland, and be- 'come a member of the kirk.'* The Pope's attendants requested he would get him confined. 'God forbid,' replied the Pope, 'that I would punish an honest man, who has 'gone through so many hardships, for what he thought the 'good of my soul.' He made him some presents, and gave him full liberty to be guided by his *Revelations*.

With regard to the magistrate's duty in preventing error from spreading. Error may be considered in its different stages: either in its rise or progress. Montesquieu is of opinion, that, when there is but one religion established in a state, it lies at the magistrates' discretion to reject a new doctrine; but, when many religions have got a footing in the state, they are to be tolerated.

The first part of this maxim is observed in Spain and Portugal: the second, to the happiness of mankind, and the honour of religion, is practised all over Germany, Switzerland, Holland, &c.

It is true, the first beginning of controversy may be checked by a steady severity: and a new doctrine may, perhaps, be eradicated with the death of its authors, without leaving any seeds of future innovations. But still the difficulty recurs, whether the misguided religionist, whose opinions do not interfere with the peace of society, the property of individuals, and the rights of magistracy—and which are less subjected to the criterion of human understanding, being of the speculative kind, is punishable by the magistrate's sword? Reason combines with religion, to inform us that he is not; and the experience of ages evinces the impotence of such attempts. 'The melancholy with which the fear of death, 'torture, and persecution, inspires the sectaries,' says Mr. Hume, 'is the proper disposition for softening religious zeal. 'The prospect of eternal rewards, when brought near, over- 'powers the dread of temporary punishments: the glory 'of martyrdom stimulates all the more furious zealots.

* Moore's Travels.

'Where a violent animosity is excited by oppression, 'men pass naturally from hating the persons of their ty- 'rants, to a more violent abhorrence of their doctrine: 'and the spectators, moved with pity towards the supposed 'martyrs, are naturally seduced to embrace those prin- 'ciples which can inspire men with a constancy almost 'supernatural.'

At all events, whatever may be said in favour of suppressing, by persecution, the first beginnings of error; no solid argument can be alleged for extending severity to multitudes. Or if persecution of any kind be allowed, the most violent is the most effectual. Imprisonments, fines, and confiscations, are heavier torments, than the stake, wheel, or gibbet. For the man is tormented, but the error is not suppressed.

What is to be done, then, in the first stage of the error. Let the spiritual society, to whom the religionist belongs, when he attempts to alter her doctrine, correct, admonish, and exhort him. If he continues to be obstinate, let her refuse him her sacraments, the participation of her spiritual communion, the communication of her spiritual worship.—To this alone her power is confined: she may caution her members against the contagion of his errors. Life, limb, the enjoyment of his estate, the authority of a husband, are founded in nature, and cannot be alienated by any spiritual jurisdiction; much less by the civil magistrate, who is not a competent judge of error; and whose sword may pierce the body, but can never controul the mind.

But if the laws of God, and the rights of mankind, do not permit to oppress an individual, for his mental errors; what are we to say when numbers of sects get footing in a state? Let the door of toleration be thrown open to them all, and not one of them be exposed as a butt to all the rest. Mutual hatred will relax, and the common occupations and pleasures of life, will succeed to the acrimony of religious disputations.

In vain do Calvin, Bellarmin, and other apologists of persecution, arm the magistrate with texts of the old law, which commands to stone the false prophets to death,

to put idolatrous cities to the sword, and 'to slay Agag 'before the Lord.' The Jewish polity is quite different from modern political institutions. God himself was the immediate governor of society, who worded, by himself, their laws and ceremonies—who blended together their civil and religious institutions—and who had an immediate power to deprive sinful man of the life of which he himself was the author. Neither was it every false prophet he ordered to be stoned, nor every city he ordered to be put to the sword; but such prophets as sprang up from amongst the Jews themselves, and such cities as belonged to the Jewish theocracy—I mean, cities inhabited by Jews who had been instructed in his laws and ceremonies. 'If a false prophet rise up amongst you, 'in those days.' 'The city which shall worship gods un-'known there before,' &c.

This was rebellion against the state which he had taken under his immediate protection, and which was of so peculiar a frame, as to be entirely dissolved by the introduction of idolatry. As, if a set of preachers got up now, and instilled into the minds of the people, a doctrine that would overthrow the three powers of the state in those kingdoms, to introduce a democracy; or monarchy into Holland, on the ruins of a republican government—they certainly would suffer in both places, not for their religion, but for treason, in attempting to overthrow the respective governments.

Hence, the neighbouring cities, plunged in idolatry, which were not under the laws of the Jewish theocracy, were not destroyed on account of their false worship, but on account of crimes committed against the laws of nature, which had filled the measure of their iniquities. And Agag, a name so familiar in the mouths of fanatical preachers, in the time of Charles the First—and which, to the scandal of that age, and the discredit of the English peers and cavaliers, was couched in their address to Queen Elizabeth, requesting the death of Mary, Queen of Scots, 'as Samuel slew Agag.' Agag, I say, was not put to death for worshipping his false gods, but for his cruelty and violation of the laws of nations: 'As thy sword,' says the prophet, 'has made many wo-

'men childless, so your mother shall be a widow this day.'

Sensible rewards and sensible punishments were requisite for the Jewish people. It was requisite to raise a wall of separation between them and neighbouring nations to prevent the fatal effects of their inclination to idolatry. Their religious worship required to be inseparably interwoven with their civil polity, and considered the infringers of the law of God as rebels to the state, and enemies of their country. Their worship was an instrument in the hands of God, to exterminate people polluted with the most abominable crimes. Hence, afflictive punishments and death itself decreed by the law of Moses, against Jews fallen into idolatry, or into any other crime contrary to the law.

Those institutions were to have an end: the new alliance, promised in the old, has levelled the barrier that separated Jew and Gentile—uniting both in the profession of the same faith. It proposes more sublime and exalted motives than those proposed by the Mosaic law. In the room of temporal rewards and temporal punishments, it has substituted those of an invisible and eternal nature. It acknowledges no strangers: it knows no enemy: it opens a door of mercy to all, and an entrance into its mysteries, without terror or compulsion. It is a delicious fruit that attracts the eyes of those who choose to view it; but never forces the hand to pluck it. Jesus Christ never said: 'whoever does not follow me, shall be miserable in this world, shall be considered as a rebel to the state in which he lives, unprotected by the laws, doomed to the fagot, or stripped of his property.'—He leaves it to every one's choice, either to follow or renounce him: 'if any one choose to come after me.' '*Si quis vult.*' When his very disciples intended to quit him, he does not retain them by compulsion, but, says, in a gentle manner, 'are you, also, willing to quit me?' And it is in vain to boast a gospel liberty, when people are dragged, by confiscations, forfeitures, and death itself, as so many forced victims, into the sanctuary of religion.

It is an abominable palliative to say, that, though the fathers are bad proselytes, yet the children or grand-children may be good Protestants, or good Catholics. As if

the son should be put in the way of salvation, by the perjury and hypocrisy of the father; religion propagated by crimes, and evil committed, in consideration of the good which may arise from it, in express opposition to the tenets of that religion which forbids it. The religion of Jesus Christ is proposed to all; and the more universal it is, the less it employs terrors or constraints to enforce obedience to its injunctions. It stamps the sentiments of humanity, dictated by the law of nature, with a peculiar character of sweetness and charity.

Scarce had its founder assembled a few disciples, when two of them, storming with rage for being refused the rights of hospitality, requested permission to bring down the fire of heaven on the inhabitants. They imagined themselves in the times of Elias, when God punished with visible chastisements the insults offered to his prophets. Jesus Christ undeceives them: 'you know not to what spirit you belong; 'the son of man is not come to kill, but to save.' As if he said, both to them and their successors: 'It is no longer 'the time of menaces and torments. You live under a law 'whose spirit is not the spirit of error, but the spirit of con- 'fidence and love. The Master whom you serve, does not 'thirst after the blood of his enemies; he does not choose 'to see them at his feet, in a fit of rage and despair. 'Forced homages are odious in his eyes: thunder and the 'exterminating sword are not his arms: he is only come to 'convert and save souls: but not to destroy or famish the 'bodies of men.'

Hence, he has not given to those whom he charged with the commission of extending and propagating his religion, any instruction but that of imitating his zeal, his patience, and his charity towards mankind. He has furnished them with no other means of making proselytes to his religion, but persuasion, prayer, and good example. The theocratical government is no longer confounded and interwoven with civil and political institutions. The kingdom of Jesus Christ is not of this world: he leaves the rulers of the earth the full enjoyment of their prerogatives, whether they know him, or whether they blaspheme his name: and he leaves their subjects in full possession of their rights, as men.

Jesus Christ does not choose for subjects but such as freely list in his service. Those who are rebellious to his voice, he terrifies with the punishment of a future state; and has not commissioned any power on earth to enlarge, by force, the boundaries of his kingdom. However his creatures may be divided in opinion about speculative points, he has left them one law which is liable to no interpretation, and must ever be interpreted in the literal sense: 'love one ano-'ther; and do not to others, what you would not have others 'do unto you.'

Calvin and Bellarmin's remaining arguments consist in similies, and some misconstrued passages of the fathers, who, in their homilies, inveigh against errors in faith, as against adultery, forgery, &c. on account of the divorce, a breach of divine faith causes between God and the Christian soul, and the enormity of *forging* or *counterfeiting* the divine credentials, with the *hand of error*. But the disparity is obvious. Adultery, forgery, and similar crimes, fall immediately under the jurisdiction of the civil magistrate, on account of the injury offered to society, by invading the property of individuals committed to his care. The man who is in error, hurts none but himself. If others be misled by him, it is their own choice, and the result of their free will, over which the civil power has no controul; nor the ecclesiastical power, but as far as it can refuse such persons the sacraments and the other religious symbols of her communion, which no other church will give those out of her pale, and which no person, out of her pale will require.

But, in every state, is not blasphemy punished, though of a spiritual nature?

Blasphemy is punished, because it is an open irreverence to the Deity, the knowledge of whose attributes, and the dread of whose justice, is the very basis of civil society. But an erroneous opinion, in religion, can subsist with the respect due to the Deity.

A man, engaged in error, proposes to himself to serve God in the manner he thinks most pleasing to the Sovereign Being. Though he mistakes the right road, yet his intention is sincere. Moreover, blasphemy involves a breach of manners, which has a natural tendency to disturb the peace

of society. A friend takes offence, if his friend is abused in his presence; a brother, if his brother is used in an indecent manner.

A Jewish rabbin may preach in his synagogue, that the Messiah is not yet come, and extricate himself as well as he can, by doing away the weeks and days of the prophet Daniel. No Christian can blame him: for we all know that it is the man's belief; and that he is sincere, though in error at the same time. But this Jew, convinced that Christ is respected by the Christians, and worshipped by them, as their God, would expose himself to the rigour of the magistrate, if he openly called Christ an impostor: because he insults the magistrate more than if he gave this denomination to his father or brother.

The most monstrous absurdity, then, that ever met with apologists in church or state, is the misdirected zeal that punishes the body for the sincerity of an erroneous conscience. Whereas, no person deserves more the severity of human laws, than the impostor who betrays it. The divines themselves, whose forced interpretations of scripture, and theological disputes, have armed sovereigns against their subjects, agree that no person can act against the immediate dictates of an erroneous conscience. Hence, the Jew, who is under a conviction that Christ is not God, would be guilty of gross idolatry, if, from motives of worldly interest, he worshipped him with the Christians. In punishing him for not worshipping Christ, you punish the candour, sincerity, and uprightness of a deluded man, who is afraid to offend his Creator. The same can be said of all others who dissent from any established religion.

But I will be told, that, in reasoning thus, I renounce my own creed; whereas the rescripts of Popes, the establishment of the inquisition, and numberless texts of the canon law, relating to *heretics*, shew what a Catholic clergyman ought to believe.

I have already declared, and sufficiently proved, that the rescripts of all the Popes that ever sat in Peter's chair, or ever will, can never make an article of faith for Roman Catholics; no more than a king of England's proclamation can make an

article of faith for English Protestants, though he is head of their church.

Positive laws and human establishments, temporary sanctions and local regulations, are no creeds, nor articles of religion: and, happy for the honour of the Protestant religion in these realms, that they are not. No Catholic divine ever attributed such power to a general council, as Sir William Blackstone attributes to the British Parliament. 'It can change,' says he, 'the religion of the land, and do 'every thing under heaven, that is possible.' If all its acts were to be considered as articles of faith, (as some paltry scribblers would fain obtrude on the public, the texts of the canon-law, and the rescripts of Popes, as articles of Catholic belief,) the world has never seen such a religious creed.

The reader would see, in Gothic characters, imprisonment and death decreed against the priest, for saying his prayers; *to pervert or be perverted* to the see of Rome, punished as high treason; a second refusal to take the old oath of supremacy, liable to a similar punishment. He would see the neighbour authorised to take his neighbour's horse; the son authorised to strip the father of his property; the articles of Limerick, under the solemn faith of a capitulation, violated without the least provocation on the part of the inhabitants. From those he would pass to others of less importance. He would see a solemn act of the legislature, commanding women to declare their own shame, and making it high treason in them to marry the king, if they were not virgins,* another making it high treason in people who saw the nuptial rites performed, and the monarch go to the nuptial bed with his spouse, to believe that he was married to Anne of Cleves.

The Catholic orator, who would fain be on equal terms with his Protestant brother, either in the pulpit or in print, would amplify his theme, enumerate the circumstances, and in a long strain of invective, hold forth that it is a principle of the Protestant religion, to persecute to death those of a different religion; to encourage disobedience and rebellion in children to their parents; to rob a man of his property; to violate the laws of nations; to be so incredulous as not to be-

* See the monstrous Acts of Parliament, in the reign of Henry VIII.

lieve their own eyes; and to administer to the passions and lust of their kings: then to produce extracts of their statutes, in corroboration of the charge, and to cast those horrors on all the Protestants in the world!

The candid, impartial man, would be more nice than to confound the actions of men, and their positive laws, with the principles of the Protestant religion. And candour should induce the ministers of the gospel, not to revile the body of Catholics, by extending local regulations, exaggerating facts, and erecting the mistakes and prejudices of a few, into a religious creed and a symbol of orthodoxy for the whole.

Those laws, then, that doom heretics to death, as well as the establishment of the inquisition, are no parts of a Catholic's creed; no more than the fore-mentioned acts of parliament are part of the church of England's creed.

The true religion should be preserved and perpetuated by the same means that established it—by preaching the word of God, attended with prudence and discretion—the practice of all Christian virtues—boundless peace and charity.

Machiavel is of opinion, that 'disarmed prophets never 'made any conquests.' Whatever respect is due to him, on account of his skill in sanguinary politics and literature, in this maxim he betrays equal ignorance and impiety. No prophet ever appeared more destitute of arms than Jesus Christ: no prophet ever made such rapid and extensive conquests—I mean conquests such as he intended to make, by winning the hearts, changing the interior dispositions of men, and, from bad and wicked, making them better and more virtuous.

The Christian religion gained ground under the heathen emperors, in the midst of the most violent persecutions, during three centuries.

The reverend gentlemen, who thought it lawful for kings to handle the sword, in vindication of the Deity, should have recollected that all the fathers, during five centuries, took this famous saying of Tertullian for their motto: '*Non est* '*religionis, religionem cogere.*' It is not the province of religion, to force religion: it is needless to crowd my page with them. St. Gregory the Great, who lived in the sixth cen-

tury, and knew the obligations of religion, as well as any of his successors, writes to a bishop who had beaten one of his clergy for heresy, that it is an unheard of and novel method of preaching the Gospel, to enforce faith with the cudgel.—'*Nova et inaudita prædicatio, quæ baculo adigit fidem.*' No heretics more dangerous in a state than the Priscillianists, whose maxim was—to swear and forswear themselves, sooner than betray their secrets. Their doctrine was condemned in a Council in Spain, but their persons left at liberty. Two Spanish bishops, Ithacus and Ursatius, solicited the tyrant Maximus to put Priscillian to death. Hence St. Martin of Tours, and all the bishops of Gaul and Spain, would never communicate with those sanguinary prelates, who were afterwards banished. Even a council that was held, would not admit any bishop who would communicate with one Felix, who concurred in the accusation of Priscillian, and whom the fathers call, 'a murderer of heretics.'

The Council of Toledo forbids the use of violence to enforce belief: 'because,' add the fathers, 'God shews 'mercy to whom he thinks fit; and hardens whom he 'pleases.'—'*Præcipit sancta synodus nemini deinceps ad 'credendum vim inferre. Cui enim Deus vult, miseretur; 'et quem vult, indurat.*'* And the Council of Lateran, under Pope Alexander the Third, acknowledges, that the church rejects bloody executions, on the score of religion: which proves to demonstration, that the canon charged to the fourth Council of Lateran, under Innocent the Third—in which canon 'the secular powers are addressed to make 'an oath, to extirminate all heretics out of their territo-'ries, and, in case of refusal, to have their subjects absolved 'from their allegiance, and the lands of the heretics to be 'seized by the Catholics,' &c.—is spurious. Collier, the Protestant historian, in his fifth volume of ecclesiastical history, acknowledges that it is not found in any copy coeval with the Council. Some hundred years after the Council, it was produced to light by a German: and we know full well, that, at that time, several spurious pieces were produced, to serve the purposes of rancour.

* Cap. de Judæis, dist. 43.

Were even such a decree, or any other of a similar nature, genuine, the Catholics would reject them, without any breach of faith: because the church has no power over life, limb, the rights of sovereigns, the property of individuals, or any temporal concern whatsoever. Her bishops, then, whether separately, or in a collective body, cannot graft any such power into their spiritual commission. They would act in an extrajudicial manner, and beyond the limits of their sphere. This I have proved in my Remarks on Mr. Wesley's letters, and elsewhere.

Far from countenancing cruelty, death, and oppression, 'the spirit of the church was, in such a manner, the spirit of 'meekness and charity, that she prevented, as much as in her 'power, the death of criminals, and even of her most cruel 'enemies,' says Fleury. 'You have seen how the lives of the 'murderers of the martyrs of Aunania were saved; and St. 'Austin's efforts to preserve the Donatists (who had exer- 'cised such cruelties against the Catholics) from the rigour 'of the Imperial laws. You have seen how much the church 'detested the indiscreet zeal of those bishops, who persecuted 'the heresiarch Priscillian to death. In general, the church 'saved the lives of all criminals, as far as she had power. St. 'Augustine accounts for this conduct, in his letter to Mace- 'donius, where we read, that the church wished there were 'no pains in this life, but of the healing kind, to destroy not 'man, but sin, and to preserve the sinner from eternal 'torments.'*

If, in after ages, some Popes and bishops deviated from this plan of meekness and moderation, their conduct should not involve a consequence injurious to the principles of the Catholic church, which condemns such proceedings. The religion of Catholics and Protestants condemns frauds, fornications, drunkenness, revenge, duelling, perjury, &c. Some of their relaxed and impious writers have even attempted not only to palliate, but even to apologize for such disorders.—The children of the Christian religion daily practise them: is the Christian religion accountable for the breach of her own laws?

* Fleury, Discourse 2, No. 9.

We prefer, then, the primitive fathers of the church, to Sylvester á Prieris, and some other canonists: and we presume as much knowledge and zeal for the Catholic religion in Gregory the Great and his predecessors, as in any of his successors, in ages less refined.

The opposition given in Catholic countries to the establishment of the inquisition—the death of the inquisitors by the hands of the people—and the general odium it raised—prove that sparks of the moderation and meekness recommended in the Gospel, and practised in the primitive times, with regard to people of a different persuasion, were not quite extinct, even in the ages of darkness and barbarism. Popes themselves opposed its introduction into Venice: and whether from policy or piety, I shall not take on me to determine.

But Berkley remarks, that, 'if policy induced a Pope to 'oppose its introduction in a certain state, policy might have 'induced another Pope to introduce it into his own.'* I am convinced he was not mistaken in his conjectures.

The Pope was in possession of a city which formerly gave birth to so many heroes, besides a good territory bestowed on him by several sovereigns. He thought it high time to look about him, when all Europe was in one general blaze. The liberty of the Gospel, preached by Muncer and several other enthusiasts, threw all Germany into a flame, and armed boors against their sovereigns. As he was a temporal prince, he dreaded for his sovereignty, as well as other crowned heads in his neighbourhood; and the more so, as his soldiers were better skilled in saying their beads, than handling the musket.

Great events, the downfal of empires, and the rise or destruction of extraordinary characters, are commonly foretold in oracles, both sacred and profane; and he found himself in the same dubious and critical situation with Montezuma, when the Spaniards landed in America.

"Old prophecies foretel our fall at hand,
"When bearded men in floating castles land."†

Long before the reformation, the dimensions of his city

* Minute Philosopher. † Dryden's Indian Queen.

were taken; the line was extended over its walls; and it was discovered that it was the 'great city, built on seven 'hills, the harlot that had made the kings of the earth drunk 'with her cup; and that her sovereign was Antichrist, the 'man of sin,' mentioned by St. Paul, in his epistle to the Thessalonians. Wickliff, Huss, and Jerome of Prague, had laid down a rule, many years before, that 'Popes, princes 'and bishops, in the state of mortal sin, have no power:' and a state of grace was, doubtless, incompatible with the character of Antichrist. Jerome of Prague, who was burnt afterwards at Constance, to shew that Rome was the harlot of the Revelations, after beating a monk, and drowning another, dressed one day, a prostitute in a Pope's attire, with the three-crowned cap, made of paper, on her head, and in her head-dress, without being so careful of the rest of her body; leads the female pontiff, half naked, in procession through the streets of Prague, in derision of a religion professed by the magistrates.

Some *well-bred* divines there are, who justify such proceedings, on the principle that it was requisite, at that time, 'to cry aloud, and use a strong wedge to break the knotty 'block of Popery.' I do not believe there is a well-bred Protestant living, who would applaud either *martyr* or *divine* who would exhibit such a merry spectacle in the streets of Dublin or London; or who would shed a tear for his loss, if, after exhibiting such a show in Rome or in Paris, he fell into the hands of the inquisition, or were sent to the gallies. The gospel truth is no enemy to decency.

St. Paul, in pleading his cause before Festus, did not inveigh against his vestal virgins, the adulteries of their gods, or the wickedness of his emperors. Let a religion of state be ever so false, the magistrate who professes it, will feel himself insulted, when it is attacked in a gross, injurious manner: and, if apologies can be made for indecencies and seditious doctrines, under pretence of overthrowing idolatry, some allowance must be made for men who think themselves insulted by such attacks.

The Pope, then, as a sovereign prince, had every thing to dread, when the thrones of the German princes began to totter from the shocks of inspiration: but what still increased

his alarms, was—the unfolding of the Revelations, which held him up to all Europe, as the Antichrist, the general enemy of Christians, who should be destroyed. Lest any one should miss his aim, it was proved from the Revelations, that he was the beast with ten horns; and, in bearing down such a game, the world was to be renewed, and the peaceful reign of the millennium, during which Christ was to reign with the saints on earth, was to begin. The time was approaching. Old John Fox, the martyrologist, says, that 'after long study and 'prayers, God had cast suddenly into his mind, by di-'vine inspiration, that the forty-two months must be re-'ferred to the church's persecution, from the time of 'John the Baptist.' This calculation was to bring on the Pope's destruction about the year sixteen hundred. Brightman was more precise, and foretold the final down-fal of the Pope, in the year fifteen hundred and forty-six: others in fifteen hundred and fifty-six: and others in fifteen hundred and fifty-nine. Luther came closer to the famous æra; and published his prophecy, in which it was revealed to him, that the Pope and the Turk would be destroyed in two years after the date of his oracle. This certainly, was a close attack on the Pope, who in all appearance, did not like to die so soon, even of a natural death. He apprehended the accomplishment of the oracles the more, as at that time almost every one was inspired, and ready to do any thing for the destruction of Antichrist.

Alexander Ross, in his view of religion, describes numbers of those prophets, and amongst the rest one Hermannus Sutor, a cobbler of Optzant, who professed himself a true prophet, and the Messiah Son of God: a very dangerous neighbour for Antichrist! This man, to receive the prophetic inspiration, stretched himself naked in bed; and, after ordering a hogshead of strong beer to be brought close to him, began to drink in the source of inspiration, and to receive *the spirit by infusion;* when on a sudden, 'he,' to use the words of Alexander Ross, 'with a Stentor's voice and a horrid 'howling, among other things, often repeated this: Kill, 'cut throats, without any quarter, of all those monks,

'all those Popes. Repent, repent: for your deliverance is 'at hand.'* However extraordinary such a character would appear now, yet at that time, inspiration was so frequent, that one would imagine all Germany was a nation of prophets; and Hermannus, who was afterwards put to death by Charles, lord of Guelderland, had credit enough to make proselytes.

The Pope, thus aimed at, as an object of destruction, from all quarters—and seeing, almost in every nation in Europe, a nursery of prophets foretelling his ruin, and animating the candidates for sanctity to undertake the pious task—began to tremble, not only for his territories, but moreover for his personal safety. He knew that the imaginations of his Italian subjects were naturally warm; and that, if but one of them caught the prophetic flame, the stiletto would soon be darted into Antichrist. He found Imperial laws already enacted, and as he was a temporal prince whose person was more exposed than any highwayman in Europe, he copied those laws into his directory; and erected the Inquisition as a barrier between himself and the formidable foes, who not only foretold his downfal, but encouraged their followers to fulfil the prediction.

The impartial reader, in tracing this formidable tribunal, will discover a political establishment, and a temporal safeguard. None can infer from its institution, that it is lawful by the principles of religion, to deprive a man of his life, precisely on account of his worship: and every one must acknowledge, that, if ever a prince, whose life and territories were in danger, was authorised to take the severest precautions to secure both, no mortal could plead for greater indulgence in having recourse to rigorous measures, than one who united in his person the dignity of a prince, which at that time was both an object of envy and detestation to people who considered sovereignty as subversive of Christian liberty—and the character of a sovereign pontiff, which made him pass for an outlaw, and the great enemy of Christ, in whose destruction the world was so deeply concerned. Let any person put himself in his case, and judge for himself.

* Ross's View of Religions. In the appendix, p. 31.

It is then, to those authors who disgraced themselves, and exposed the oracles of the Christian religion to the derision of infidels, with their fanatical calculations, their beasts, horns, and strained allegories of seven hills—it is to the rage of people who could not take more effectual steps to get him stabbed in his church or his palace—and to the terrors of a man who thought himself justifiable in providing for his personal safety—that the world is indebted for the inquisition in Rome. Its fires are daily extinguishing, in proportion as prophecy is diminishing; and the liberty of a refined age discovers no horns on the head of a Ganganelli, or Benedict the Fourteenth, who united in their persons the grandeur of kings, the discretion of bishops, the elegance of courtiers, and the learning of philosophers.

The two last prophets I have read who have brought the Pope's destruction nearer our own times, are Whiston and Burroughs. The first foretold that the Pope's destruction would happen in seventeen hundred and twenty-four. And the second finding Mr. Whiston's prophecy contradicted by time, began himself to prophecy that this great event was to happen in seventeen hundred and sixty. Yet, since those two prophets 'have been gathered unto their father,' the air of Rome has not been embalmed with the effluvia of the smoking blood of a Jew; and in Spain and Portugal, we hear no longer of human victims being offered up as 'a sacrifice of agreeable odour to the Lord.'

In those two kingdoms, the inquisition owes its origin to causes much similar to those which gave it rise at Rome; but causes, however, which did not so immediately affect the sovereign, who was blended with the common mass of monarchs, without any peculiar distinction to expose him to the hatred of mankind; or to afford his assassin a plea of impunity, by alleging that he was the deliverer of the world, by ridding it of the enemy of the Son of God, described in the prophecies of Daniel, pointed out in the Revelations, and whose downfall was foretold at such a time, by the most celebrated interpreters of scripture.

The Spaniards struggling for a long time with Maho-

met's followers who had invaded their country, and reduced them not only to the most abject slavery, but moreover forced them to supply the fire of their lusts with continual fuel, by sending an annual tribute of Christian virgins to their seraglios, made at last that great effort so memorable in history.

It is well known that before the defeat of the Moors, and their total expulsion from the Spanish dominions, they were preparing, under hand, for war, and had their leaders already chosen. Banished for ever from a kingdom where they had trampled on the laws which all Christians, and even heathen fathers deemed most sacred, a barrier to their return was erected; and, as by their own laws, every Christian who has any connexion with a Mahometan woman, is to pass through the fire, the tables were turned on themselves, and the expectants of an earthly paradise were threatened with the fagot, if they returned to initiate the children of Christians in their mysteries.

The most effectual way to remove prejudices, is—to put one's self in other people's situation. And if the establishment of the inquisition seems severe and unreasonable, it must be acknowledged, that the love of life, and the abhorrence of oppression, are passions that very often overpower reason itself. No man would choose to be considered as an outlaw on whose head a price was set, and to whose destruction thousands were animated, under the sanction of scripture. Neither is it in the nature of Christian Kings, who often destroy their own relations, when they suspect them for aspiring to their throne, to suffer the sworn enemies of the Gospel, and the corrupters of the morals it enforces, in possession of their provinces and palaces, when they can recover what they deem their right. It was, then, dread of danger, and love of liberty, a deep sense of injuries, and a provisionary caution against death and oppression, not a principle of religion, that gave rise to the inquisition in Rome, Spain, and Portugal. It is not from the church it can derive any power: and if it has any other motive in view than to secure the peace of society by temporal means, it exceeds the limits of its authority. For error in faith is not a crime, but relatively to a supernatural order, which does

not come within the verge of civil jurisdiction: and the last resource of the church is only a canonical censure. Those censures she never denounces, but against her own rebellious children, reared up in her bosom: and with regard even to those, she is bound to use the greatest precaution.

Her spiritual weapons should not be drawn but against the enormities of individuals; nor against those, when they are powerful enough to raise a faction or party; nor against any one, when it is probable they will not obtain the end proposed—I mean, the correction of the sinner. 'With regard to the multitude, censures are 'never employed,' says St. Austin. Exhortations, not commands—instructions, not menaces—are, then, her only weapons. And when any of her popes or bishops adopted any other plan, they consulted more their power, and the rigour of the law, than the rules of prudence. They behaved like those hot headed princes, who, finding a great number of their subjects guilty of insurrection, would put them all to the sword, at the hazard of seeing their kingdoms depopulated.

Whence, then, came those rigorous laws on the score of religion to be introduced? If speculative errors, unconnected with principles subversive of subordination and morality, have been the only motives, it must be acknowledged, that they originated in an abuse of power, and an error of fact, as well as of right, which made princes believe that, as they were the arbiters of life and death they could punish all kinds of crimes, whether against God, or the peace of civil society. In matters more immediately within the reach of the civil magistrate, the laws of all nations afford instances of power extending beyond the limits of reason, and confounding the sacred rules of equity, which proportion the punishment to the offence. Thus, in Holland, a subject forfeits his life, if he kill a stork, when a few dollars would be a sufficient penalty: especially for a Dutchman. In England, the cutting down a cherry-tree in an orchard is a capital offence. And in Ireland, I have seen two men put to death—the one, because a sheep was found

in his barn, which the real thief had left there; and the other, for a miserable calf-skin, which he bought on the high-road, from the man who stole it; and who, doubtless, did not inform the purchaser of the manner in which he had acquired it:—when the laws dictated by God himself, decreed no more than the restitution of an ass, against the thief who had stolen one from his neighbour; and a four-fold restitution against the man who stole an ox.

If princes and other rulers, then, magnify objects in such a manner as to make trifles capital, in consequence of their power, to which they imagine no bounds should be prescribed; let us not be surprised if monarchs, who thought themselves the delegates of Heaven, and answerable for any crime against the divinity, which they would countenance in their state, have enacted laws which torture the body for the errors of the mind.

It was with difficulty that king Edward the Sixth was prevailed on, not to commit his sister Mary to the flames. For he could not reconcile his conscience, to permit his sister to live in idolatry, when it was in his power to check the progress of such a disorder.

We see, by the different edicts against heretics, in the Theodosian code, that the first Christian emperors did not, however, consider religious error as a sufficient cause for capital punishment. Constantine grants a free toleration to all Christians, in one of his edicts: in another he restrains this indulgence to Catholics alone. In one edict, he orders the churches to be taken from the Donatists: in another, he moderates the rigour of this edict, by permitting them to return to their country, and to live there quiet; 'reserving 'to God the punishment of their crime.' Remarkable words! We have seen before, how the primitive fathers opposed sanguinary executions, and pleaded for liberty of conscience. St. Hilary earnestly requests the Emperor Constantius to grant his subjects liberty of conscience, whether they be Arians or no

If, then, in an age enlightened by the works of the fathers, and after the example set by Constantine, the Emperor Theodosius condemned Manichæans to the fire; it must be

more owing to abominable practices, than to speculative errors. And, if succeeding emperors continued the same rigour, it is that sedition or immorality, or both, kept pace and were incorporated with speculative deviations. Scarce an age, since Theodosius's time until of late years, but brooded some immoral or seditious doctrine, which armed the magistrate's hand with the exterminating sword. Great part of St. Austin's time was taken up in pleading for mercy with the African governors, in favour of the Donatists and Crescellians, who continually exercised the greatest cruelties.

Another age gave rise to the Patarini and Runcaires, who amongst other errors maintained, that no mortal sin could be committed by the lower part of the body. The theory was reduced to practice; and, doubtless, the magistrate was roused to severity.

The Albigenses said that God had two wives. Marriage, however, was condemned, without considering chastity as a virtue. In detestation of the sacrament of the altar, churches were turned into receptacles for the unhappy votaries of venus: and in the sanctuary where the magistrate was accustomed to see the minister of religion officiate, nothing could be seen but offerings to Cloacina. In twelve hundred and thirty, the Stadings of Germany honoured Lucifer; inveighed against God for condemning that rebel-angel to darkness; held that one day he would be re-established, and they should be saved with him. Whereupon, they taught that, until that time, it was not requisite to serve God, but quite the contrary; and reduced their theory to practice.

To write the history of all the sects which gave rise to the severe sanctions of kings, from the time of the Emperor Theodosius down to the sixteenth or seventeenth century, would be to attempt writing a history of all the horrors and abominations of which abandoned man is capable. In this long space of time, the sects most free from any mixture of immorality, gave umbrage to the civil power, by their seditious tenets and insurrections.

Huss's doctrine, in Bohemia, sowed the seeds of civil wars. Wickliff's doctrine, in England, was productive of similar fruits. The fagot did not blaze in England until the Lol-

lards began to overturn the state. In the sixteenth century, what wars, what commotions, in Germany, in consequence of fanatical delusion. The most moderate Protestant divines of that age, complain in their writings, of the confusion introduced by sectaries. Heylin, in his cosmography, talks of some of them 'begotten in rebellion, born in sedition, and 'nursed by faction.' And Doctor Walton, in the preface to his Polyglote, says, that 'Aristarchus heretofore could scarce 'find seven wise men in Greece; but that, in his time, so 'many idiots were not to be found: for all were divinely 'learned.' 'Hence,' continues the Doctor, 'the bottomless 'pit seems to have been set open: and locusts are come out 'with stings, a numerous race of sectaries who have renewed 'all the ancient heresies, and invented many monstrous 'opinions of their own.' In examining, then, the laws enacted against heretics, and tracing them up to their origin; in taking a review of the times and circumstances in which they were enacted, and the tenets of the persons against whom they were levelled—in weighing the Emperor Constantine's words, already quoted—and observing the instability of his opinion, in the change of his laws—we can, with every reason, presume that error in doctrine was never deemed a sufficient title to deprive a man of his life or property, by the most pious and enlightened Christian legislators.

Immorality or sedition, mingling with the speculative opinion unpunishable in itself by any civil tribunal, drew the vengeance of the laws upon the entire system and its abettors; as the circulation of bad coin is punished by the magistrate, not on account of the particles of gold or silver, but on account of the base metal, which predominates and debases it. If time, civilization, commerce, a more extensive knowledge of mankind, and the rights of society, helped the mind to work off the feculence of pernicious opinions, as rough wines work off their tartar: freedom of thought, its inalienable prerogative was at last reconciled amongst most men with the principles of morality, and the peace of society. Men have changed, but long habit and the power of rule have still, in many places, kept up laws which confound mistaken notions of a spiritual nature, with practical principles

which disturb the order of society. Heresy is of too indeterminate a signification, to become the object of legal vengeance. And to punish a man for Popery, is to punish him because another pronounces a word of three syllables. Let the Heretic and Papist, who rob, steal, murder, preach up sedition, rebellion, and immorality, suffer like all other felons. But the magistrate who punishes an honest, peaceable man, for following the religion of his education, and the dictates of his conscience; and the legislators who authorise him to do so; both forget themselves and the rights of mankind.

The heathen magistrates punished none for worshipping many gods. But we read of a city whose inhabitants were all drowned, for adopting the impiety of Diagoras, who was a declared atheist.

The Christian magistrate will not punish a man who has no religion; because the versatile conscience of such a man will mould itself into any frame. But the upright man who, from fear of offending God, will not resign his way of thinking, but upon a thorough conviction that he is in error; is deemed unworthy the protection of the laws. His conscience, which it would be a crime to betray, is made a crime by positive institutions. Thus, Tiberius's artifice is revived. It was prohibited by the laws, in his time, to put a virgin to death. A virgin is accused of high treason; and, on conviction, (an easy matter in his days,) her virginity is pleaded, in bar to the execution of the sentence; he ordered the executioner to ravish her, and then the law took its course. Thus guilt and punishment were reconciled.

The laws of God command me not to act against the immediate dictates of my conscience. The laws of man make this conformity to the dictates of my conscience a crime, and I am accordingly punished.

Towards people confirmed in the prejudices of their education, and the religion of their fathers, no severity, tending to deprive them of the rights to which nature entitles them, should be used. It is the unanimous opinion of the fathers, and a large volume could be composed of passages, extracted from the works of modern writers of every denomination, in support of the assertion—

'We know that faith may yield to persuasion; but it 'never will be controuled.'* 'Remember that the diseases 'of the soul are not to be cured by restraint and violence.'† 'Indulge every one with civil toleration.'‡

If, to the spirit of the Gospel, the authority of fathers, councils, the practice of the primitive times, and the opinions of the most learned of the modern writers, we add arguments drawn from the sources of divinity, we expect to disarm the magistrate, and to prevail on him to sheath the sword which God never commanded him to wield against the professors of peaceable errors.

Faith is a gift of God, which it is not in the power of the state either to give or take away. It depends chiefly on the change of the heart, the interior dispositions of the mind, and the grace of the Almighty, which it is in his power alone to give, in greater or lesser abundance to his creatures. We do not pretend to open the gate to error, or to lull mortals asleep in an indifference to the truth. We only beseech the powers of the earth not to add to the calamities of Adam's children, by fines, confiscations, poverty, restraints, or death, for abstruse and speculative matters beyond the reach of human controul. We know that God being every where present to call his creatures to his service, to support them in their hope, to confirm them in his love, to help their endeavours, and to hear their prayers, it is their own fault if they perish. To some he gives the knowledge of his law; but they reject it. Others he inspires with the spirit of prayer: but they neglect it. He speaks to the hearts of all: but few listen to his voice. Some he converts by an effectual grace, who plunge themselves a second time into their disorders. Some he strengthens and fortifies in the constant love of order and justice to the last moment of their lives: and others he gives up to their blindness and corruption. He permitted the first man to sin, and thus to involve us in all the miseries, when it was in his power to prevent sin, without thus destroying his liberty. And this will ever be an insoluble difficulty to man.

* Flechier, bishop of Nismes. † Cardinal Camus.
‡ Fenelon to the Duke of Burgundy.

Faith, then, depending entirely on the interior dispositions of the mind, the quantity of grace, and the measure of spiritual science, which it is in the power of God either to increase, or, from a just but hidden judgment, to diminish; the want of it cannot be punished by any earthly tribunal: because the magistrate's power extends only to outward crimes that disturb the temporal peace of society, but not to the hidden judgments of God, nor to the interior dispositions of the mind, nor to the disbelief of divine truths—the necessary result of both. Death, restraints, and confiscations, then, on the score of religion, are murders and robberies, under the sanction of mandatory.

'We were of opinion,' says St. Austin, writing to the Manicheans, 'that other methods were to be made choice 'of; and that to recover you from your errors, we ought to 'persecute you with injuries and invectives, or any ill treat-'ment; but endeavour to procure your intention by soft 'words and exhortations, which would show the tenderness 'we have for you: according to that passage of holy writ—'The servant of the Lord ought not to love strife and quar-'rels: but to be gentle, affable, and patient towards all man-'kind; and to reprove with modesty those who differ from 'him in opinion. Let them only treat you with rigour, who 'know not how difficult it is to find out the truth, and avoid 'error. Let those treat you with rigour, who know not how 'rare and painful a work it is calmly to dissipate the carnal 'phantoms that disturb even a pious mind. Let those treat 'you with rigour, who are ignorant of the extreme difficulty 'that there is to purify the eye of the inward man, to ren-'der him capable of seeing the truth which is the sun and 'light of the soul. Let those treat you with rigour, who 'have never felt the sighs and groans that a soul must have, 'before it can have any knowledge of the Divine Being. 'To conclude, let those treat you with rigour, who never 'have been seduced into errors near akin to those you are en-'gaged in.

'I pass over in silence, that pure wisdom, to which but a 'few spiritual men attain in this life; so that though they 'know but in part, because they are men; yet, nevertheless,

'they know what they do know with certainty; for in the 'Catholic church, it is not penetration of mind, nor profound 'knowledge, but simplicity of faith, which puts men in a 'state of safety.'*

To such an illustrious authority we shall add another,—Salvianus, bishop of Marseilles, discoursing on the Arian Vandals, speaks as follows: 'they are ignorant of what is 'commonly known among other men; and only know what 'their doctors have taught them, and follow what they have 'heard them say. Men so ignorant as these, find themselves 'under a necessity of learning the mysteries of the Gospel, 'rather by the instructions that are given them than by 'books. The tradition of their doctors, and the received 'doctrines, are the only rules they follow, because they know 'nothing but what they have taught them. They are then 'heretics, but they know it not. They are so in our account, 'but they believe it not, and think themselves so good Ca-'tholics, that they treat us as heretics; judging of us as we 'do of them. We are persuaded that they believe amiss, 'concerning the divine generation, when they maintain the 'Son inferior to the Father; and they imagine that we rob 'the Father of his glory, who believe them both to be equal. 'We have the truth on our side, and they pretend it on 'theirs. We give to God his honour, and they think they 'honour him better. They fail in their duty, but they ima-'gine they perform it well; and they make true piety con-'sist in what we call impious. They are in a mistake, but 'with a great deal of sincerity; and it is so far from being an 'effect of their hatred, that it is a mark of their love of God; 'since by what they do, they shew the greatest respect for 'the Lord, and zeal for his glory. Therefore, though they 'have not true faith, they nevertheless look upon that, as a 'perfect love of God. It belongs only to the Judge of the 'universe, to know how those men will be punished for their 'errors at the last day.'*

'As to what is concealed from the knowledge of mortals,' says St. Chrysostom, 'let the searcher of hearts determine, 'who alone knows the measure of knowledge, and the quantity

* Salvianus.

'of faith: whose judgments are inscrutable, and ways un-
'searchable.'*

Religion, then, recoils at the thoughts of stripping the victim for his mode of worship. We should make allowance for the weakness of our fellow creatures; and reflect that few persons view objects in the same light. What makes a deep impression on me, makes but a slight impression on another. Universal orthodoxy has never been established, since Cain has built the first city, and separated from the children of God, nor never will to the end of time.

Amidst the dark and doubtful images of things, the sport of the passions, the prejudices of education, the disputes of the learned, and the clouds that hang over weak and fluctuating reason, it is hard to separate the clear from the obscure, truth from error, and to assign them their proper situations in light and shade. Add to this what I remarked before, that faith is a gift of God, to which the heart must be disposed by the operations of an interior grace, which God alone can give, and which is obtained more by prayer than by disputing. If we take a survey of nature itself, which God has given up to the disputes of men, the smallest insect baffles our severest scrutiny. From the ant up to the elephant, and from the germination of a blade of grass, to the immense bodies that swim in the yielding ether above, every thing is an inexplicable mystery. The very soul with whose nature we should be better acquainted, and from whose active powers we derive our faculties and judgment, is a torch with which we are enabled to view the universe, and yet our philosophers know not where it shines. Some assign the brain for the seat of this immortal spirit: others the blood; others the pineal gland; and others, unable to comprehend how matter and spirit can be so closely interwoven, as to form one compound called man, assert that the soul abides at a distance from the body, and influences it as the sun influences certain plants, that turn round and humour its motion.

What an immense library could be made up of all the books on this immortal spark that animates us! Whether

* Homilia contra anathematizantes.

it existed before its union with the body—whether it undergoes the same fate of extinction—if it survives, whether it goes to the silent shades of the dead, naked, or clothed in a thin pellicle, imperceptible to the anatomist's eye, but qualifying it in the other world for feeling the smarting sensations excited by tormenting fire, which otherwise could not affect a pure spirit, without having recourse to an extraordinary power, the miraculous exertion whereof is spared by this coat of imperceptible *skins*, cut for the spirit in a philosopher's brain—the soul's state and residence in the long interval between death and the final consummation of all things—

Burnet, the learned author of the Theory of the Earth, laughs at the purgatory of the Catholics; but strikes into a path in which few Protestant divines would choose to take him for their guide. He admits none to the clear sight of God, until after the resurrection; heaps up testimonies to vindicate prayers for the dead; establishes *Kades*, a receptacle for souls, and a middle state where they expect the coming of Christ, and the sound of the last trumpet.*

If, from ourselves, and nature that surrounds us, we make an excursion into the region of mysteries, with what darkness has not God overspread 'the face of the deep!' What disputes between Catholic and Protestant writers on one side, and the Arians and Socinians on the other, about the divine generation of the Son of God! What a deluge of blood spilt on that occasion, when the Arians were supported by powerful emperors, who drew the sword to decide the controversy!

Should one of the Bramins come amongst us, and after studying our languages, sit down to read the scriptures, to consult our writers, and to determine upon the choice of a religion, what a laborious task! From the time of Pelagius, down to our days, what disputes about original sin! How could it be propagated to a child whose body could not sin, whose soul came pure from its Creator's hands, whose father and mother were purified themselves from original stain, and guiltless in complying with the institutions of God and

* In his Book De Statu Mortuorum et Resurgentium.

nature. Let this Bramin read the works of the divines of the church of England, in favour of infant baptism, he will regret his not having been consecrated to God before the use of his reason. When he reads the Anabaptist divines against infant baptism, he will rejoice that he did not enter too soon into a covenant, whereof he did not know the conditions and terms.

When Barclay published his apology for the Quakers, he cut out a good task for the divines of the church of England, who were obliged to display their erudition in order to refute him.

If from baptism we pass to the Lord's supper, what difficulties to encounter! What arguments against the real presence by Zuinglius, Calvin, Du Moulins, Claude, Tillotson! And what formidable opponents have not those writers to engage, in the persons of Luther and the Lutheran divines; Bossuet, Arnauld, and the numerous tribe of Catholic divines! Text for text; reason for reason. Assailants and defendants take their weapons from the same arsenal, and handle them with surprising address and skill.

If the church of England be consulted on the important mystery, her answer only puzzles and perplexes:

'What is the inward part of the Sacrament?

'The body and blood of Christ, verily and indeed received 'by the faithful.'

For as Doctor Burnet remarks, the divines who composed the liturgy, had orders to leave it as a speculative point, not determined; in which every person was left to the freedom of his own choice.* If the divines, after searching the Scriptures and Fathers, call philosophy to their assistance, Mr. Locke, one of its oracles, will tell them, that the idea of body and the idea of place, are so closely connected, that it is impossible to conceive one body in two different places at the same time. Cartesius, who was the first that dispossessed Aristotle of his throne, Gassendi, that famous priest, who revived and improved Epicurus's system of atoms, Cassini, and thousands beside, were as well ac-

* History of the Reform. b. 3.

quainted as Locke, with the nature of place and bodies, and doubtless his superiors in knowledge of the mathematics; yet they could discover no contradiction in the same body being in different places at the same time, when once they supposed the interposition of infinite power, and the pliancy of space and matter, to the irresistible will of omnipotence, which can either create or annihilate them.

Thus, after a laborious excursion into the provinces of philosophy and theology, the philosophical divine must return back to the first elements of logic and grammar, that treat of the modes of speech; and, from the combination of time, place, circumstances, the nature of the testament, or last will of a man on the eve of his death, (but a man who united in the same person, the sinless weakness of humanity, with the power and nature of the Godhead,) determine whether he spoke in a literal or figurative sense. For place and body, matter and space, are incomprehensible riddles which the greatest philosophers are at a loss how to unravel. The sensations of cold, hunger, thirst, pain, and pleasure, convince us sufficiently that we have bodies, whose daily decay we are continually repairing with sleep and aliment. We are, in like manner, convinced that there is such a thing as place, when we remove from the fire-side to bed, where, locked up in the close arms of sleep, we are for a while in an intermediate state between life and death: dreaming sometimes that we are sovereigns, swaying the sceptre of authority; and at other times trembling under the hands of the executioner, who has the axe in his hand to sever the head from the body, or the rope to strangle us: alternately enjoying the grandeur of kings, and undergoing the punishment of criminals, without the reality of either. The different impressions we receive from the sun, moon, and stars, scorching flames, and refreshing springs, make us believe that there are other bodies in nature, besides those frail machines we carry about us.

In a word, sensations from within, and impressions from without, concur to convince us that there are places and bodies. The arguments of divines, and the severity of human laws, in support of those arguments, consigning those

bodies to prison, death, banishment, or hunger, are collateral proofs that we have those bodies, and that we feel their existence by means of painful sensations. Yes; the immortal Berkley, bishop of Cloyne, has proved by arguments hitherto unanswerable, that there is no demonstration for the existence of one single body in nature. He has reconciled the Catholic and Protestant philosophers and divines, about the real presence, by cutting off, at one blow, both *body* and *place*.

Our whole life, according to this system, adopted by several learned men, is but one continual scene of delusion. Objects we never saw, during the day time, are present to us in our sleep, and make a deep and lasting impression. Who knows, then, but all the actions we perform, when we imagine ourselves awake, are real dreams? We are spirits created millions of years before the Mosaic account.

In that pre-existent state, we gloried too much in our knowledge; and, as a just punishment, we are given up for a short time to dreams and deceptions, not on earth, or in corruptible bodies, for there are no such things, and whoever says there are such things, can never prove this assertion: but the great theatre on which we play the sportive farce, is nothing else but God's immensity, which can never fall within the reach of corporeal organs, eyes, ears, hands, &c. for the existence of such organs is a mere delusion.

Origenes, the most learned of the fathers, who wrote six thousand books, and was complimented by Porphyry, the heathen philosopher, was of opinion, that the souls of men were angels, who, in the great conflict between the good and bad spirits, observed a strict neutrality, and were doomed to corruptible bodies, in order to try their sincerity. Had Origenes been as well versed in philosophy, as our modern writers, he would have confined himself to spirits, and granted bodies no existence in the class of beings.

Happy for millions were the philosophers' system founded in reality, and that we had no bodies! For the disputes of theologians have destroyed and famished a good part of the creation. We have every respect for the Christian religion and its ministers of all denominations, and without any

doubt, for that system in which we have had the happiness of being reared up. But we are extremely sorry that religion has ever been made a pretext for persecution or oppression.

We have taken the liberty, in the course of this treatise, to glance at some religious as well as philosophical systems, to shew the weakness of reason, and the impossibility of establishing universal orthodoxy.

Should this treatise fall into the hands of any of our legislators, in whose power it is to ease the necks of their inoffensive subjects from the galling yoke of oppression; we expect from their wisdom and feelings, that they will no longer consider difference in religion as a sufficient reason for hindering the young gentleman from purchasing a pair of colours, and fighting the battles of his king and country; the industrious citizen from realizing the fruits of his labour, in getting landed security for his money, and purchasing an estate, descendible to his children; the physician, the opulent farmer, the man of property, from carrying a gun, a sword, a case of pistols, for their defence from the attacks of the midnight assassin or highwayman; the clergyman, who instils the principles of good morals into the minds of the ignorant who would follow the fierce instinct of savage and uncultivated nature if they were deprived of their pastors, from the protection of the laws, which now leave them exposed to the caprice and fury of every ruffian, in whose power it is to shut up their chapels, and get them transported: When it is obvious that such restraints arise from speculative points disputed on a narrow ridge by the greatest men the world ever produced—when philosophers themselves are bewildered in their notions—and when the learned are at variance, about matters far beyond the reach of the bulk of mankind.

Should it be said that these laws are seldom put in force; it can be answered that the liberty of the subject, which is the birth-right of man, should not depend on the capricious benevolence of his neighbour. The law should be the common mother whose arms should be open to all; and the ghost of intolerance, more destructive than Attila's sword, should vanish on the approach of the rays of benevolence,

which are now blazing all over the continent. Attila's sword destroyed but such as it met in its way: but the rage of religious feuds has thinned the world of fifty millions of human beings; and is still trampling, in these kingdoms, on compassion, on equity, on national interest.

In Ireland, where such scandalous scenes have not been exhibited, as last year in Scotland and England, the ghosts of those legislators who enacted the penal code, are still looking, with a clouded, malevolent joy, over the long wastes and desolated pastures they have made in a fruitful country; and supplying the want of sword and fagot, with a more lasting and tedious torment—I mean, the hunger and distresses of thousands. They have renewed and perpetuated the torments invented by the former princes of Tuscany. They make the living expire in the arms of the dead.

The liberality of the times, the interest of the kingdom, the wisdom and humanity of our rulers, every thing cries aloud for the repeal of the laws enacted on the score of conscience. If subordination and policy require what, in every country, is called a religion of state, though in fact an encroachment on the natural rights of man, when it excludes from him the privileges to which he is entitled by nature: yet this happy system of toleration should be introduced by excluding in this kingdom the Catholics from any high offices under the crown: secondly, from the privilege of sitting in the senate: thirdly, if the use of arms gives any umbrage, from the privilege of carrying them, except to such as have a mind to serve their country in the army, or such persons as are possessed of a real personal estate, amounting to whatever value the legislature thinks fit to determine: all other laws, heretofore enacted, to be null and void. The kingdom would soon flourish: and the brilliant example, set to such princes as have not as yet thrown open the gates of toleration, would rescue mankind from the heavy yoke which misconstrued religion has laid on their necks.

The Author of nature intended men for society; and entitles every man to the advantages of that condition, who is free from all principles and practices injurious to the civil good of society. The great Giver alone can repeal the uni-

versal charter. He has not done it: and I hope that I have sufficiently proved that he has not delegated that power to any of his creatures.

The rulers of the earth, whether Catholics or Protestants, owe all social benefits to their loyal subjects of every denomination. If one of these powers withhold their people's native rights, it is no excuse for the other, that their conduct is countenanced by their neighbours' example. Honour, humanity, and the rights of mankind, should suggest to modern legislators to repair the losses, caused by their predecessors' misguided zeal. And as the clergy of all denominations, consider themselves the delegates of heaven, and invested with the commission to prescribe a mode of worship to man, let them propose it in a manner that may secure its triumph over the heart; brighten it up with the genial rays of humanity, benevolence, and love, and not cloud it with the sullen gloom of severity, oppression, and distress. For Christ who is the Creator of all, has not declared in his gospel, that one should be excluded from the protection of the laws, and persecuted for his worship; and the other authorized to famish, starve, and insult the weakness of a fellow creature.

MR. O'LEARY'S DEFENCE;

CONTAINING

A VINDICATION OF HIS CONDUCT AND WRITINGS

DURING THE LATE DISTURBANCES IN MUNSTER.

WITH A

FULL JUSTIFICATION OF THE

ROMAN CATHOLICS,

AND AN ACCOUNT OF THE

RISINGS OF THE WHITE BOYS.

TOGETHER WITH

MR. O'LEARY'S ANSWER

TO THE

FALSE ACCUSATIONS OF THEOPHILUS,

AND THE ILL-GROUNDED INSINUATIONS

OF THE

RIGHT REV. DOCTOR WOODWARD,

LORD BISHOP OF CLOYNE.

THE

INTRODUCTION.

WHOEVER attempts to give an account of public transactions should be above the reach and power of hope and fear, and all kinds of interest; that he may always dare to speak truth, and write of all without prejudice, religiously observing never to abuse the public faith, but to guard against the bias and affections of those who would endeavour to impose on him by false or exaggerated reports. He should not confine himself to a bare recital of the actions of men, but to lay open the motives and principles from which they took their rise, and upon which they proceeded to their final issues. When in public transactions in which all parties are concerned, some persons make themselves more conspicuous than others, it is not barely sufficient to mention their names. The hearts of such actors must be laid open. The reader must be let into their most important motives and designs, and favoured with a sight of those secret springs which moved them with enterprise whether it succeeded or miscarried. He should be disinterested himself, and attribute no bad motive to persons whose actions could bear a favourable construction; when he is convinced that they had no interest in interfering in those scenes of disorder and tumult which he chooses for the subject of his narrative.

Upon those principles Doctor Woodward should have proceeded when he introduces me on the stage after his account of the disturbances in the south of Ireland; disturbances which disgraced the nation, by the manner in which they were heightened in the foreign prints, painting us in a state of barbarism and rebellion, and which however unjustifiable, yet borrow (in the county of Cork at least) their importance more from the colourings of exaggerating writers

than from any signal or singular event which would suit the dignity of the historian's pencil, whose office it is to pronounce the destiny of the *great ones* of the earth; to fix their character with posterity, to do justice to virtue and worth, and to admit no figures into his historical group but the figures of the great and illustrious. It is true that public transactions should be recorded, though the characters which appeared on the scene are far from being illustrious. The Roman historians have transmitted to posterity the war of the slaves. And the Right Reverend Bishop of Cloyne has favoured the public with a general account of the operations of the Munster *rabble*. But he differs widely from the patterns after whom he should have copied: for however unworthy of the historian's pen the exploits of shabby heroes may appear, yet when he hands their achievement down to posterity, he should paint them in their proper colours, and range them under their respective banners. When Tacitus describes the revolt of the Pannonian legions, incited to sedition by Persennius, a common soldier, and the *Captain Right* of his time, he informs his readers of that incendiary's profession. But when the Bishop of Cloyne promises, in his title-page, 'A general Account of the Insurrections of the South 'of Ireland, with their rise and progress,' he leads all his warriors into the field in the same uniform. They are all a Popish mob disarming Protestants to overthrow the established religion. In this assertion I shall take the liberty of differing in opinion from the Bishop, with the same freedom that Lesley, a dissenting minister, contradicted Archbishop King, when that prelate wrote his History of the State of the Protestants in Ireland under James the Second; and as Beverly Higgins, a gentleman of the established religion, differed widely in opinion from Bishop Burnet, when he wrote the history of his own times.

Happy! if I could discover nothing reprehensible in the Bishop of Cloyne's pamphlet, but historical inaccuracy! It would affect me no more than some of the stories of Heredotus, who was so liable to misinformation. For a *mob* is a *mob*, whether they be *Protestants or Papists*. A Popish mob may crop horses and burn ricks of corn in Ireland: and a Protestant mob may burn houses and attempt to plunder the

bank in London. It is the crime, not the religion of the criminal, which disturbs the peace of society, and is punished by the judge.

But when in the Bishop's pamphlet I see myself personally attacked, and (what concerns me more than any personal injury) my religion glanced at as inconsistent with the security of the state. When I see Catholic prelates, who are an ornament to the age, wounded by an intimation that their allegiance to their king in temporals is a prevarication of their obedience to their supreme pastor in spirituals. For here, according to Doctor Woodward's inuendo, perjury must be the alternative: if they swear allegiance to the Pope, they cannot swear allegiance to the king: if they swear allegiance to the king, they cannot swear allegiance to the Pope—still they swear allegiance to both; perjury then is inevitable. A dreadful dilemma arising from a consecration oath, translated into English for the purpose of perplexing the ignorant, and left unexplained for the purpose of rendering venerable prelates obnoxious to the public. When I see Doctor Woodward one of the pilots of the vessels of the established religion hanging out the signal of distress, and crying aloud on the deck, 'The Church of Ireland is at this present moment in imminent danger of subversion.' From whom? From the dissenters ready to pull down an ecclesiastical establishment, and the Catholics ready to set up their own. That is to say, from two classes of subjects more interested in improving *thirty-nine* acres of ground for the support of their families, than in abolishing the *thirty-nine articles* of Bishop Woodward's profession of faith, which, (however founded in the Scriptures) thousands of Protestant divines all over Europe would not subscribe. When I now see the three great classes of High-churchmen, Dissenters and Catholics, whom I have formerly seen to drown their religious distinctions in the noise of the alarm drum, and march under the same banners to protect the beds of their wives, and the cradles of their children against the common foe.—When I see them now disunited, (if they were mad enough to be disunited by the croaking of controversy, and in speculative points which puzzle the mind, to forget

social friendship which cheers and warms the heart.)* When I see them disunited, or on the eve of a rupture in consequence of this alarming proclamation, *truths, which at other times should be kept in silence for the preservation of harmony, must now be brought to public notice*, I am at a loss what to say. By such a declaration the Bishop acknowledges that his pamphlet is not calculated to preserve harmony, otherwise he would have been silent; or his words are a riddle which must be unravelled by a greater Œdipus than Mr. O'Leary.

However, as the unhappy disturbances in the South of Ireland have afforded a pretext for the dissolution of this harmony which reigned amongst the natives of this kingdom a few years before; and as the Catholics in general, as well as Mr. O'Leary in particular, have been misrepresented, the following defence, in which the insurrections are mentioned, is humbly submitted to the judgment of the public. If Mr. O'Leary speaks of himself, it is because he is personally attacked. Every man who is put on his defence, must do the same. In the course of his defence he will hold up the historical mirror.

If it reflects any specks on the faces of some who may behold it, let them attribute their deformity to themselves. Truths shall guide my pen, and the historian must be impartial.

If I enter more deeply into the subject than I first intended, it is in order to shew by every proof which moral evidence can afford, that the Catholics of this kingdom could not form any design against either church or state, as has been maliciously insinuated in several pamphlets. The Bishop of Cloyne has given the profile; I shall draw the face in full.

* Mr. O'Leary hopes that none will cavil at these words, as if uttered by a latitudinarian. He is a steadfast Catholic; but is no more inclined to quarrel with any person on account of his religion, than to quarrel with him on account of the colour of his clothes.

MR. O'LEARY'S DEFENCE.

THE unprovoked attack made on my character was for a long time a mystery to others as well as to myself. The perusal of several pamphlets at length enabled me to unfold it. The murmurs of the lower orders against proctors and tithe-canters, induced the authors of several publications (some of them were beneficed clergymen) to wish for some other mode of supporting the clergy, less oppressive to the poor than the collection of tithes attended with continual litigations, but equally advantageous to the clerical profession, and more honourable, as it would remove every occasion of dispute between pastors and their parishioners. This plan, however countenanced by the ablest men in England, and by many sensible men of the established church in Ireland, made Theophilus *mad*, and the Bishop of Cloyne *somewhat angry*. The alarm bell was rung by Theophilus, and the presses began to teem with the Bishop's pamphlets. Some batteries were to be erected to defend the usual mode of collecting tithes. And on the walls of the church was planted the *rusty* cannon of popery to *fire*, and give notice of the approach of the enemy. It was laid down as a maxim, that in the Catholic church the clergy enforce the payment of tithes *jura divino*;* and that the clergy of the church of Rome would resume the tithes with the assistance of foreign powers. This master-piece of generalship (if I may use a word which I cannot find in Johnson's Dictionary) succeeded. What Lord Clarendon said of the reign of Charles the First, was verified in eighty-seven. The Papists were the most

* See Theophilus.

common place, and the butt against which all the arrows were directed. Ghilinis's letter and the Bishop's consecration oath were roused from their dusty pillows, and stripped of their long Roman dress were introduced into every circle in an English garb. The arrival of those foreigners alarmed several on their first appearance, as much (and with as much reason) as the tidings of the arrival of eight hundred Jesuits mounted on dromedaries, alarmed the citizens of London in the reign of Charles the Second, though the messenger who frightened others knew that he was secure from the danger.

It happened that in order to reclaim by reason people who had shaken off the yoke of authority, I told the whiteboys that if they had grievances to complain of, the legislature alone was competent to redress them; informing them at the same time, that no power on earth would permit any set of men to overturn established laws by private authority.* The word *grievances* alarmed the Bishop, for reasons unknown to me, but best known to himself. This was the the signal of war, as if my conduct and writings had been incentives to sedition. Every advantage was taken of me. But it is now time to repel force by force, and to recover the ground of which my aggressors have taken possession during my careless inactivity.

Pray, then, my Lord Bishop of Cloyne, and you Theophilus, whose mouth, like that of Palinurus, is better qualified for *blowing that trumpet* which you have thrust into mine, *tuba ciere viros martemque accendere cantu.* On what ground can you bring the charge against Mr. O'Leary? Can you ground it on my writings? You have garbled them; you have mangled them; you had models to copy after. And imitation is no bad help. A man attempted once to deny the resurrection by the same texts that establish the belief of it. He succeeded by adding a monosyllable, and placing a point of interrogation in the room of a full stop, and transposing a word. Text runs thus:—*Surrexit. Non est hic. He is risen. He is not here.* The literary magician got rid of the difficulty by punctuating and transposing the words in the following manner:—*Surrexit ne?*

* The letters may be seen in the Appendix.

Non. Est hic. Is he risen? No. He is here. There is ingenuity. And by his skill in *mangling phrases* the Bishop of Cloyne changes the way of the cross is the road to the crown, into sedition.

When I come to the vindication of my writings, I shall show more of the Bishop's ingenuity in scattering limbs, which I shall restore to their proper places. Doctor Woodward and I live in the same country. Can he stand forth, and arraign my conduct?

The disturbances took their rise in the diocese of Cloyne, about the month of September, 1785. I never had been in that diocese but twice on a visit to Mr. Roche of Trabulgan, who, about two years before the disturbances, had retired to Naples for the benefit of his health. I had no acquaintances in the diocese of Cloyne, except the Protestant and Catholic gentlemen of consequence. And however great my esteem for, and the confidence I repose in them, I am not so divested of common sense as to put myself in their power; it would be the means of losing their esteem.—Want of prudence, says Lord Littleton, is often times want of virtue. And I would forfeit my claim of both, if I urged a deluded multitude to their destruction by encouraging them to fly in the face of the established laws, and to deprive any person of the property secured to him by the state. For whom does the Bishop of Cloyne take me then, when, in his Postscript, interlarded with the garbled passages of my addresses, he throws out insinuations so injurious to my character, and attempts to palliate and extenuate those insinuations under the thin gause of a salvo. I do not say that the reverend author intends to sow sedition, but if such were his design?* will any man of sense be satisfied with the excuse of a monosyllable *but* or *if?* I am not acquainted with the lower classes in his diocese, though they know me from character, as a man more inclined to lead them into the path of subordination and peace, than to goad them to madness.

I have renounced every claim to tithes by sacred vows.

* Bishop of Cloyne's Pamphlet, p. 193.

The Lord Bishop of Cloyne then may rest satisfied that I never intended to sow sedition from a rapacious view to his ecclesiastical revenues, and that I can frankly say with parson Adams to his brother Trulliber, in Fielding's Joseph Andrews, *Nihil habeo cum porcis. I have no call to your tithe pigs.*

The Bishop and the public must then acknowledge, that I was in no manner whatever interested in tithes, much less in fomenting riots and disorders. But common sense and prudence must acknowledge, that a person in my situation could not with propriety stand by as an indifferent spectator of tumults and disorders which threatened the peace of the community, and which I well foresaw would be construed by malevolence into a Popish confederacy against the state, as Theophilus has since construed it. Neither does the Bishop of Cloyne contradict him in the short and partial account he has given in his pamphlet of risings which he attributes to a Popish mob.

From one parish in the diocese of Cloyne, the disturbances began to spread to another, and as bad example seldom ends where it first began, the contagion at last reached the borders of the diocese of Cork; and as a gangrene that eats its way from the extremities of the body to the very vitals.—Captain Right's proclamations made their way to the very heart of the city, about five months after they had been published in the diocese of Cloyne. On a Sunday morning a seditious notice was posted (and breathing nothing but a downright disrespect to the clergy) on the gate of the parish chapel, inviting such as found themselves oppressed by *pampered Theologians*, whose God *was their belly, and whose religion was a hogshead of wine*, (the very words of the notice) to meet at an appointed hour in order to regulate their pittance according to the Gospel rule. That very day I was going on business to the country, when to my surprise I met with numbers of common people reading a similar notice posted up against the gate of my own chapel. Was it meddling with the politics of the Protestant country, as the Bishop of Cloyne's favourite Theophilus upbraids me, to make war upon disorder and licentiousness? Or is it because the

Bishop of Cloyne was silent and passive during the tumults which had changed his diocese into a scene of disorder and anarchy, that I should be silenced by the clamour of sedition sounding the trumpet at the threshold of my chapel? I deferred my excursion, and at every congregation from eight to one o'clock, I enlarged upon the scandal and impropriety of such proceedings, pointed out to the common people the danger to which they exposed themselves, the confusion in which they were involving the community; and made use of the most persuasive arguments in my power to reclaim them to their duty. If I deserved to be compared to any illustrious character, it is not to Mark Anthony working upon the passions of the multitude, in order to arm against Brutus and his confederates, that the Bishop of Cloyne should have compared me. If he intended a compliment, and wished to tempt my vanity, of becoming a boaster, he should have compared me rather to Junius Blesus appeasing the Pannonian legions, who had been urged to revolt against their officers by a common soldier called Persennius, the Captain Right of his days.

I thought it my duty both as a loyal subject, a clergyman, and a member of civil society, to contribute to the preservation of public order, and to guard deluded multitudes against destruction, to the utmost of my power.

The honour and interest of the Catholic body, often misrepresented, and become the theme of scurrilous or fanatical writers, were further incentives to my zeal. I recollected the unmerited abuse given for a long time in the papers to the Catholics, because seventeen house-keepers in Dublin had unguardedly signed a requisition to the High Sheriff for the purpose of convening an aggregate meeting relative to a parliamentary reform; though I am confident the seventeen knew as little about the impropriety of their signing that requisition, and foresaw as little the offence it would give, as the High Sheriff himself foresaw that he would be attacked by the Court of King's Bench. And as to the Catholics, in their disqualified situation, they could not with either prudence or propriety, follow any other line but that of a strict neutrality in a political question, on which neither the friends nor opponents of a parliamentary reform would acknowledge

them competent to determine. I heard moreover in my very recent recollection, the false alarm rung all over Ireland and Great Britain, on the occasion of Mr. O'Connor, whose lineal descent from Roderick O'Connor, the last Monarch of the Milesian race, in the reign of Henry the Second, was published in the papers: the formidable forces of that claimant to the royalties of his ancestors, forces which a member in the House of Commons affirmed to amount to a thousand, but which, soon after, in the English papers, were increased to eighteen thousand, well disciplined men—another member's declaration in the Senate, that the Protestant interest was *now at stake*, and that he would stand forth its champion; and the consequent challenge made on the Minister of State to know if government had marched the army against King O'Connor. When I recollected a private gentleman, at the head of few servants, armed with spades and clubs, keeping possession of a litigated spot of land, confirmed to him afterwards by a decree of the Courts of Justice; when I recollected this gentleman enlarged into a mighty monarch, through the magnifying glass of misrepresentation, I had every room to apprehend that the enemies of the Catholics would misrepresent them to government, according to their *usual custom*, and that the quarrel between the peasant and the proctor for a basket of potatos, would be misconstrued into a struggle between the king and the subject, for the jewels of the crown. The nobility and gentry of Ireland are now convinced that my conjectures and apprehensions were groundless, when they read the slanders of Theophilus, and the pamphlet published by Doctor Woodward.

If I were allowed the liberty of using a metaphor, wild and extravagant indeed as to the manner of the expression, but natural enough as far as it may convey my meaning, I could say, that my apprehensions on similar occasions were not the fruit of fancy. They are the natural growth of the county of Cork, and vegetate in that soil. In that county Machiavel's maxim, *divide* and *govern*, has been followed for many years, and the plan for changing the pretended dangers of Popery into so many steps of the political ladder whereby to

ascend to power and consequence, had been for many years invariably pursued. The Catholics, excluded from the senate and councils of the nation, could not be known to every English nobleman who came here to manage the reins of administration, during a temporary residence. Chance may bring him acquainted with some individuals, but he must be a stranger to the real state and principles of the body at large. The Catholics, then, could not be known to government but in the colours in which those persons painted them. And from such political limners, a just resemblance between the picture and the original, could not be expected.

Hence, in the county of Cork, scarce could Catholics breathe until the administration of the Earl of Halifax and Lord Townsend, who, upon a closer investigation into their case, removed the film with which the misrepresentations of interested men had overspread the eyes of the former rulers. I had then just grounds to apprehend that the disorders of a motley group of insurgents would be made out a Popish confederacy; and I know that the silence of a man who stood for his country, in the sight, I may say of the enemy, and who has as much influence as any individual in his station, would give a colourable sanction to the accusation. Nor (however plain and simple in other respects) was I so unexperienced in life, or ignorant of the events which had happened in this kingdom, as to put myself in the power of my enemies, or expose myself to the rigour of the law, by a seditious conduct. I learned wisdom from the folly of others; and if I were inclined to be seditious, I knew that it was not my interest to give my inclinations their exertion or energy. In foreign countries I had read much about the White-boys in Ireland, and on my arrival in the kingdom, I collected every information in my power, in order to be acquainted with the history of my country.

The first paper I read after landing in Cork, was the dying speech of Buck Sheehy and others, who had been executed for Whiteboyism at Cloheen. In their speech they declared that their lives were offered them on condition that they would swear against several Catholic gen-

tlemen as confederates and abettors of Whiteboys. And who would not pass for a Whiteboy at that time, when one of the most inoffensive men on earth, Doctor M'Kenna, the present Titular Bishop of Cloyne, was escorted under a strong guard, on a pretended suspicion of an insurgent. I read of Nicholas Sheehy's fate, with which the illiberal Theophilus threatens me, and learned that a Catholic clergyman in all places, but especially here, should confine himself to the line of his duty, by enforcing morality and subordination to the laws. That unfortunate man was tried before the Court of King's Bench, for Whiteboyism, and was acquitted. Sheehy, whose blood his enemies thirsted for, is at last indicted for the murder of one Bridges, a man of no good character, whose *dead body* could not be found, but whose *living body* (if report be true, was afterwards seen in Newfoundland. The dead bodies of rogues who had been murdered in one kingdom, had been afterwards seen living bodies in another, as so many enchanted dragons, watching the Hesperian Gardens of the temple of Venus, alias *bullies to a brothel.* That this was Bridges's case I cannot affirm, but for the rest, the history of the kingdom is my voucher.* Sheehy, on hearing that a proclamation was issued against, and a reward offered for apprehending him, wrote to the Secretary of the Chief Governor, that to spare Government the expense, he would give himself up, on condition that he would not be tried in Clonmel, where he said his enemies were too powerful. A promise founded on justice was made, though it was never performed. He was sent to take his trial at Clonmel, where he was found guilty upon the evidence of the same identical witnesses whose testimony had been rejected before by the Court of King's Bench, viz. a naughty boy, a lewd woman, and an impeached thief, taken out of Clonmel jail. Hence Sheehy's jury is become as proverbial in Ireland, as the ancient justiciaries of Donfront, in Normandy, who used to hang regularly at the hour of one, every prisoner who had been tried at twelve.

Allez a Donfront, juste ville de malheur.
Ou bon est accuse a midi, et pendu a une heure.

Under the impressions which such singular events must make on the mind, and in the delicacy of the clerical situa-

* See the continuation of Curry's Memoirs of the Civil Wars of Ireland.

tion, who could suspect that any Catholic clergymen would blow the trumpet of sedition in the ears of a deluded peasantry? Or has the Bishop, like Socrates, a similar spirit to give his information which no mortal besides himself can pretend to? But reserving the discussion of such an accusation for its proper place, I must proceed in the course of my narrative.

The associations were now extending, and a notice posted up against the gates of the parish churches and chapels was a kind of standard to which all parties, without distinction of religion, flocked, and entered into a general confederacy. For the public are not to form their judgment of the disturbances from the mad declamation of a Theophilus, nor the imperfect one given by the Bishop of Cloyne. The first is a bare-faced slanderer. The Bishop gives the profile of the picture, in entirely shadowing the other side of the face, by making out the insurgents a popish mob, connived at by some Protestants, without mentioning the effectual and active concurrences of any. The unprovoked and unmerited attack made on Mr. O'Leary, by the right reverend prelate and his less reverend confederate, has forced the pencil into his hand, and now compels him to draw the picture with a full face. The notice alluded to is to the following purport. 'You are hereby cautioned not to pay 'ministers' tithes, only in the following manner, viz. potatos '4*s.* per acre; wheat and barley 1*s.* 6*d.* per acre; oats and 'meadows 1*s.* per acre. Roman Catholic clergy to receive 'for marriage 5*s.*; for baptism 1*s.* 6*d.*; for anointing and 'visiting the sick 1*s.*; for mass 1*s.*: for confession 6*d.* You 'are hereby warned not to pay parish priests' clerks money, 'nor any other dues concerning marriages. Be all sure not 'to go to any expenses at your confession terms, but let 'them partake of your own fare.'

This notice which I censured, as may be seen in my letters, seemed moderate however to many acquainted with the distresses of the poor. In vain has the Bishop of Cloyne attempted to justify proctors, tithe-canters, tithe-jobbers, &c. by declaring them to be agents to the clergy, equally necessary as receivers to lay-gentlemen. The general voice

is against them. Moreover, the comparison does not hold. The gentleman's agent only collects the rent at the expense of his employer; the tenants pay the determined sum agreed on by the lease, and if his farm should produce a hundred fold every year, he pays neither more nor less until his lease expires. But these *ecclesiastical agents*, of whom the Bishop becomes the apologist, are so many locusts, that eat up the peasant's green herbage without feeding the wind that wafts them. Several instances could be procured to prove that they gain more than their employers, whilst they distress the cottager. When the potato-stalks begin to shoot to a certain distance above the surface of the earth, the sharp-eyed lynx surveys it in the name of God and of our holy mother the church. On the spot where the stalks crowd together thick and threefold, in order to discriminate the ranks and to avoid confusion, the proctor's hand rears a landmark. Doctor Woodward thinks it a duty of a *bad pastor* to appoint agents well qualified for preserving order. The hungry peasant whose teeth water for the vegetable he had sown and reared up from its infant state, wishes to try its quality; but if he approaches within a certain distance of the fatal landmark, he is sure to share the fate of the benighted mariner, who approaches those hostile shores, when allured by the false lights held out to decoy him to the rock, on which he is to be shipwrecked. The bishop's court is the strand on which the proctor gathers the spoils. It is not the fault of the institution, nor the gentlemen who preside in the courts; but it is the misfortune of the peasant, who has neither means nor skill to cope with those *agents*, who are adepts in their professions. From many instances of the abuse made of the authority of those courts by crafty agents, I shall select one. In the province where Doctor Woodward and I reside, and now the theatre of pamphlets and politics, there lived a poor peasant; his poverty had not deprived him of those qualities which constituted a husband and a father; to him a child was born, who did not live long enough to enjoy his father's estate, he died; and for want of a shilling to purchase the hallowed ground wherein to deposite the *defunct* heir of an opulent fortune, the father rolled him up in a bundle of straw

and smuggled him into the church-yard in the dead of night. Happy! thrice happy! had he met on that fatal night with a custom-house officer. He would have escaped with the contraband goods. But alas! his destiny was to meet with one of those officers who have recourse to what the moderator calls the *Court Christian*. A decree (whether real or fictitious I cannot tell) from the Bishop's-court was produced by the carrion-hunter and another, who were hurrying away the peasant, fainting after a violent resistance. Luckily he was met by an intimate friend of mine, who released him by paying the *charnel house fees*.

These anecdotes I relate to shew that, notwithstanding Doctor Woodward's zeal in defence of what he writes in favour of ecclesiastical agents, they are oppressive, and impose both on Bishops'-courts and their employers. I do not say, that they do it with their consent: far be it from me. It was against the prophet's will his servant received presents from Naaman the Assyrian officer: and it is against the clergy's consent that their *agents* are vexatious to the poor. But there is this difference between the Bishop and the prophet: 'the latter struck his '*agent* with the leprosy; the Bishop of Cloyne spins out a 'chapter of his pamphlet to shew that his *agents are immaculate*.' I shall then join the moderator in his litany, *from such agents good Lord deliver us!* In parishes where the rectors took the tithes into their own hands, it is acknowledged that the clergyman has received much more than ever he did through the mediation of such *agents*, besides the additional comfort of seeing peace, harmony and confidence restored to his district. It is not my business to make calculations, nor is it a part of my duty to run over parishes, in order to know how far a wretched peasant may be relieved by the removal of a relentless agent, who, like a dense cloud, intercepts the rays of benignity, which would certainly cheer him by a more immediate communication with a clergyman, whose ministry is peace, and whose duty is charity. I only glance at such matters as far as they are interwoven with a subject which it is my duty to illustrate, in order to vindicate both the Catholic body and myself from the false and groundless imputation of attempting the over-

throw of the established religion, by encroaching upon the rights of its clergy.

The *supineness* with which the Bishop of Cloyne upbraids the Protestant gentlemen, shews that the lower classes were truly miserable, and that their table of rates was only proportioned to their circumstances. That they are truly miserable all parties must agree. This supineness also shews that the Protestant nobility and gentry were under no apprehension of the constitution, either in church or state. Neither was the Bishop of Cloyne; otherwise he, who is one of the pilots, would not have slept for the space of fifteen months at the helm, if he really foresaw that the ship was in danger of going to the bottom: though he now alarms three kingdoms with the danger to the established church from Catholics and dissenters, *pulling down and rising up.* But the Catholic nobility and gentry foresaw, from the reasons I have already alleged, that they would be misrepresented to Government, and that the old game of *Popish plots and confederacies* would be renewed. They had moreover their properties to defend, and their character to support: as men and subjects they were as much interested as others in the preservation of the peace of society. And the history of a country where their ancestors swayed for ages the sceptre of authority, informed them that, in the successive revolutions occasioned either by brave and fortunate aspirers, or by timid, ductile, and unfortunate kings, the Catholics have been invariably the losers. The Bishop of Cloyne then must be a stranger to the passions of the heart, of which *interest* has so strong a hold; or unacquainted with the history of the kingdom; or under a very strong bias; or prepossessed with a strange notion of their stupidity—if he supposes they had any thing to expect by the commotions of a rabble. If Government, however, had been induced to believe that tehy had such prospects in view, and mistaken the shadow for the reality, the Catholics would have become equally obnoxious. And what efforts are now making to persuade Government that phantoms are realities, let the public judge from the pamphlets dispersed all over the three kingdoms. The fox in the fable did well to take to his heels when the lion issued a proclamation, ordering all the horned beasts to quit the

forest. And although no branches sprouted from his head, yet his remark was very wise, when he said, *What if his majesty thought I had horns.* It was then prudent in the Catholic gentlemen to have taken the most effectual steps to remove every suspicion to which their *misrepresenters* are so industrious in laying them open. They were the first to take the alarm: they transmitted an address to Government through the Secretary of State. On hearing that the common people complained in a few places of the exactions and rigorous conduct of their parochial clergy, they were the first to interfere in writing to the Catholic prelates of the province, pressing them in the most earnest manner to inquire into the conduct of their clergy, and to remove, by every means their wisdom could suggest, any cause of complaint, and every occasion of obloquy.

The application could not be made to more proper persons than to prelates, whose lives are so many living and animated sermons; some of them, by their birth, titles, and fortunes, would be this instant seated in the House of Peers, deliberating with the nobles of the land, on these measures on which the fate of a nation must depend, if they could leave their creed at its threshold. Others are, by their knowledge and wisdom, qualified for directing the councils of kings. And the piety and exemplary lives of them all would make them objects of veneration in any age, or in any nation. A letter addressed to these venerable and illustrious prelates, from the Catholic gentlemen, was attended to with the same condescension as if it were the mandate of a superior. They assembled, deliberated, and enquired into the conduct of their clergy; when in four or five parishes, they discovered that the pastors and flocks could not agree, either from inflexibility in the former, who perhaps thought themselves injured by submitting to regulations dictated by their inferiors, or from the obstinacy of the latter, who would abide by no regulating standard for the support of their pastors, but such as they themselves thought fit to determine: or from a personal dislike founded perhaps upon the recollection of severe usage, prompted more by ardent and good-natured zeal, than by this sage discretion, which attains its end by

more lenient means. Let the motives of discontent be what they may, without having recourse to canonical quibbles, which must ever be superceded when the peace of society interferes, the wise prelates removed the Pastors, and substituted others in their room. A more painful sacrifice could not have been made; nor could a more evident proof be adduced to shew the falseness of the infamous charge, that the ill usage received by the Catholic Pastors from their flocks, was but a sham battle, like that of the Doctor, *who, when he beat his wife, said that he beat half himself.* A silly simile, and worthy of the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's able writer, Theophilus. Not satisfied with giving this proof of their most ardent desire for the restoration of peace and good order, the prelates gave the most public and signal proofs of a disinterestedness worthy the most apostolical times. After declaring that a small stipend was requisite for the support of their clergy, they enjoin that this stipend be not exacted with rigour; and that even if it be refused, they are not to refuse their spiritual assistance, but to shew upon all occasions, that zeal, disinterestedness, and charity enforced by the Gospel, for the sake of which they had made an anticipated sacrifice of all the prospects of this life, in their early days, at the foot of the altar. No more could have been said; no more could have been done. Such of their clergy as had not been forced by violence from their parishes, declared from their altars, that it was for the sanctification of their own souls and those of their flocks, not for the sake of any worldly emolument, that they took orders; that they required nothing of them but what they themselves were willing to give, and that no mercenary views would ever hinder them from going day or night to their assistance, whilst they had strength to perform their functions. All were unanimous in crying out with the Prophet, *if it be on my account that this storm is raised, cast me overboard.* Are these the prelates whom the Bishop of Cloyne exposes to the detestation of such as cannot explain their consecration oath, which he has translated, in his sixth edition, into English for the instruction of the ignorant? For I am to suppose, he presumes that the Peers and Commons of Ireland know Latin.

Let the zeal, activity, and disinterestedness of those prelates be compared with the passive silence of the Bishop of Cloyne for the space of fifteen months. And let the public determine to whom the community is most indebted, for endeavouring to restore peace and order to a distracted province.

Where are now those agitating Friars and Romish Missionaries sent here to sow sedition; and of whom Doctor Woodward speaks in his Postscript? I challenge him in the face of the kingdom to produce either agitating Friar, or Romish Missionary, or parish Priest, sent here to sow sedition, or who has sown sedition. The Bishop of Cloyne cannot produce one: he must then prove a negative, which, in his Postscript in extenuation of Theophilus's slanders, he acknowledges hard to be proved. The Bishop perceiving that negatives are no proofs, has a recourse to casual affirmations, by saying, *perhaps Theophilus alludes to Mr. O'Leary's Letters, &c.* Here the attack is personal on Mr. O'Leary, the Friar with a barbarous *sirname*, whose letters are most *artfully contrived to sow sedition.* Such a heavy charge requires a full investigation, and must plead my apology with my readers for proceeding farther in my defence. Previous to the arrival of the Catholic prelates in Cork, we were continually alarmed with the insurrections in the diocese of Cloyne. They spread gradually, and, as I remarked before, Captain Right's proclamations were at last posted up against the gates of the chapels of that city. *Tithes, proctors, and priest's dues*, were alleged as causes of complaint, and became the subject of general conversation.

The common people who, in times of persecution used to follow their clergy into recesses of forests, to hear their prayers and instructions, nailed up chapels in some places against their pastors in the very blaze of toleration. The disorders which would arise from such proceedings were easily foreseen; and it was requisite that some persons should step forth to stem the torrent. Doctor Mann, the Protestant Bishop of Cork, was absent for the benefit of his health: the Catholic Bishop of the same diocese, the present Lord Dunboyne, had been under the necessity of going to Dublin on

the death of the young Lord Dunboyne, his nephew, before the disturbances broke out in the diocese of Cork. The titular Bishop of Cloyne, Doctor M'Kenna, was sinking under the weight of years, and ignorant of what happened in his district. And Doctor Woodward, who had the administration of the two dioceses, was taken up with rummaging pontificals and other old books, in order to collect materials for his pamphlet, whilst the Catholic peasantry were flocking to his churches, and the lower orders of the Protestants going on Sundays to meet the Catholic congregations in his diocese, in order to swear the people, and give solidity to the confederacy in support of the regulations of Captain Right; the head pastor being either absent or infirm, or inactive, and the flocks daily maddening, who was to be applied to? Or will the Bishop of Cloyne controvert the maxim, *that in danger every person is a soldier.* The Catholic gentlemen, instead of thinking of a confederacy against either church or state, with the assistance of a *foreign power*, which so often haunts the Bishop's imagination, dreaded that it was rather a confederacy against themselves, by affording such politicians as are hostile to their interest, an opportunity of misrepresenting them to Government. In consequence, after writing to Lord Dunboyne, pressing his return as soon as conveniently possible, they deputed five or six gentlemen to the Catholic Bishop of Cloyne, earnestly requesting of him to enquire into the complaints alleged by some parishes in his diocese, to use his efforts with the people of his persuasion, in order to reclaim them to their duty, and to remove every pretext for aspersing the Catholic body, as far as his influence could extend.

Unable from age and infirmity to go in person, he requested of me to take an excursion into the discontented parishes. I set off in order to allay the tumults in the diocese of Cloyne, the first in the county where they broke out. Here an extraordinary sight was exhibited. The common people deluded into a belief that by going to Church for a few Sundays they would be less liable to punishment, if not entirely exempt from it; and authorised to carry arms in conjunction with the lower classes of Protestants, to whom

Proctors, *Tithe-jobbers*, and *the Tithes* themselves had become equally obnoxious, under this delusion they flocked in several places to the Churches, and as they had not David's Psalms in metre, they chose the old ballad *of Patrick's Day in the Morning*, for an Anthem, and got a piper to play it as a voluntary on his favourite organ, as a preparation for divine service, in approaching the house of worship. The marriage of Figaro represented on the French Stage did not raise more humour, nor attract more spectators, than did their extraordinary marriage of the Paddereen and the common Prayer-book, in the diocese of Cloyne. Irish wives are remarkably attached to their husbands, and follow them wherever they go. Upon this occasion they gave signal proofs of the constancy of their attachment. Joan followed Darby, and Judy followed Paddy to Church, where the gay and unthinking were highly diverted with the novel spectacle of hands thrust into the Baptismal font, in order to sprinkle about the *holy water*, and beads drawn out near the Communion-table to reckon the *Ave Marias*. To the gay and unthinking it was like an after-piece which creates humour, in order to relieve the mind from the impressions of terror and pity, which it had received during the representation of some serious drama. To me it appeared as a prelude to a tragedy.—It struck the serious and sensible gentlemen of both religions in the same light.

I was happy in an extensive acquaintance, and still more happy that the Protestant gentlemen were convinced of the uprightness of my intentions. My situation was delicate, and without their concurrence my endeavours would have proved abortive.

They had previous notice of my arrival in their respective districts through which I intended to pass; and I was happy in the full assurance of their co-operation. On a Sunday I arrived in a parish of Doctor Woodward's diocese.—The parish Chapel was quite deserted. The Priest was 'aban-'doned by his flock,' and the deluded multitude, lulled into a false security, had crowded to the Protestant Church as to an asylum of impunity.—Thus in former times when the privilege of the sanctuary was pleaded, malefactors flocked to the temples as a shelter against the pursuits of violated

justice. I considered a crowd of peasants actuated by resentment, brooding over some wild scheme, preparing for nightly excursions; yet saying their beads up near the communion-table, I considered them as *the abomination of desolation in the holy place*, as mentioned by the prophet Daniel. In every bead I figured to myself the warhoop of a Mexican, ready to sound the nocturnal charge, or the massy club of an Indian, soon to be ornamented with a Proctor's scalp.

I must do this justice to the Protestant clergy, in whose churches this religious farce was carried on, that they did not like such proceeding. They in reality could have said with the Psalmist, *you have multiplied the people; but you have not encreased our joy. Multiplicasti gentem sed non magnificasti lætitiam.* But what could they have done? They had no directions from Doctor Woodward to shut the doors of the churches against people who had shaken off every subordination to their own pastors. But that was the time for the Bishop himself to appear *in my poor opinion*, 'and 'which was however the opinion of every rational man, 'with whom I have conversed on the subject,' and which will be the opinion of every rational man who shall read this narrative, he should have published a pastoral letter upon the occasion, and recommended to his clergy not to permit their houses of worship to be changed into the upper galleries, crowded with a mobility, assembled for the purpose of making a farce of religion.

Had I been in his situation at the time, instead of *tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis*, I would have thought it no dishonour to stand at the door of the church, on the right hand of Mr. O'Leary, and to harangue a deluded multitude in the following manner:

'*My good people*,

'I am a Protestant Bishop, and you (as it appears) are 'Roman Catholics. It would be my glory, my comfort, and 'my joy to bring all strayed sheep into my fold, to enlighten 'them with the rays of the Gospel, to dispel the clouds of 'error, and to enlarge the kingdom of truth. It is my wish, 'and my sincere wish—it is the wish of every honest man

'who thinks himself in the right way, to wish the same 'happiness to his fellow-creature. It was the wish of St. 'Paul that his hearers were not *almost Christians, but al-* 'togethers *Christians.* And it is my wish that you were not 'only almost Protestants of the High-church, but altoge- 'ther Protestants of the High-church. It is the wish of 'charity, and if charity were banished from the hearts of 'all other mortals, it should find its last retreat *in the heart* 'of a *Bishop.* Were I then convinced of the sincerity of 'your motives, I would be not only the first to unlock the 'gates of this Church, in order to give you admittance, 'but I would be the first to go to meet you at a distance. 'But as a bad motive pollutes the best of actions, and 'as it is not from conviction of truth, nor a desire to as- 'pire to a higher degree of perfection, that you crowd 'about my house of worship, but from a sinister design to 'seek impunity for licentiousness; and under the cloak of a 'religion, which you do not believe, to conceal the out- 'rages you are intent on committing; I cannot, in con- 'sequence, profane the house of God by the admission of 'persons who, perhaps to-morrow night, will be disturb- 'ing the peace of the public, and eluding laws in the dark, 'which, in all likelihood, will hereafter punish them in 'the open day: and remind them when too late of the 'admonition which I now give from the best of intentions. 'It is not the chime of my bells, but the sound of Captain 'Right's horn, that has kindled in your breasts this flame 'of extraordinary devotion, which, perhaps hereafter, 'may be extinguished with your blood. Will you have 'me change the house of God into a barrack of sedition? 'I see in that crowd an old man, with a pair of beads in 'his hands. My good man, where are you bringing your 'beads? Do you intend to expose yourself and me, re- 'ligion and its temples, to the derision of the public? If 'you come, come from conviction, and leave your beads at 'home, or bestow them to another. It reminds me of a 'history that I read in the Scriptures. Assyrian colonists 'were transplanted to Samaria; they worshipped their 'idols and the God of Israel by turns in the same temple. 'It is not then a house of worship, but a good life, that will 'sanctify you. Instil this truth in the minds of the young

'people in your neighbourhood, and caution them against 'the practices of those who may engage them in outrages. 'If you are not submissive to your own pastors, but ob- 'stinate to their advice, what good can I expect from you? 'You are, I believe, now too old to learn, and the gene- 'rality of you all, are not much inclined to alter your 'creeds. I give you then the advice suggested by an amia- 'ble Protestant prelate, my brother Bishop of Clonfert, in 'his letter on Sunday Schools. *I cannot expect to make 'good Protestants of you, therefore I advise you to be good 'Catholics.* If you have any complaints against your own 'clergy, your Bishops will redress them; but I cannot, nor 'will I permit you to come to my churches to erect the 'standard of sedition, when I have every room to believe 'that you have no other motive in view. Nor can your- 'selves reap any benefit from a conduct which, in the eyes 'of God, is a prevarication. That God who unfolds the 'recesses of the soul; who rejects a spotted victim; and ac- 'cepts of no sacrifice, but such as a sincere, honest, and 'pure heart offers upon his altars. Nor would my churches 'grant you any security against the rigour of the laws. 'The hand of justice stretches into the inmost part of the 'sanctuary. In vain did Joah, a mighty man, grasp the 'corner of the altar: he was slain by the sword of justice. 'And much more, in vain would you seek for impunity in 'my house of worship, for the sanctuary itself is no sanc- 'tion or shelter for crimes. Follow the advice of Mr. 'O'Leary, who is here on my left hand, as you followed his 'advice when you imagined that you had more to expect, 'and were convinced that you had less to lose.

'And you, my dearly beloved brethren, of my own com- 'munion, how am I to address you! I address you with that 'confidence which my zeal for the peace of society, the pre- 'servation of good order, and the purity of good morals 'should inspire. Recollect the maxim of the heathen Sage; 'a maxim to which the blessed St. Paul has given his sanc- 'tion, *evil communications corrupt good morals.* These poor 'people are wild olive branches going to ingraft themselves 'on the stock of the Protestant religion in appearance. But 'alas! as they intend to use it only as a cloak for temporary 'outrages, they will be soon disjoined without taking suffi-

'cient time to be cicurated and mellowed by the sap or vital 'juice which circulates from the stock through the new in- 'serted branches. You may judge of their inventions by 'those of some of your own. Has my diocese ever exhi- 'bited such a spectacle as was seen in the parish of Clona- 'kilty last Sunday? Protestants going to a Popish congre- 'gation to swear the people to Captain Right's regulations! 'Was it to become Catholics? No, neither do these people 'intend to become Protestants: religious distinctions are of- 'ten lost in the idea of common oppression—I acknowledge 'it. And would to God they were for ever lost! The vices 'and virtues of all men flow in the same channels. Their 'hearts are the same though their opinions be different; and 'for those opinions to God alone they are accountable. I 'like to see all the subjects of every description in my diocese 'well united. Such an union is the strength of the state, 'and should be the glory of a Prelate. But I foresee that 'those mutual visits will consolidate a confederacy which the 'sword of the laws will cut asunder, to the indiscriminate 'ruin of the associations. For the edge of that sword has 'no eyes in it, and justice that handles it, is painted blind. 'You all complain of proctors, canters, and tithes. I shall 'do what lies in my power to remove every complaint you 'may have against the two first—no more can be expected. 'but as to tithes, they are established by law: the legislature 'alone can modify them, or substitute an equivalent in their 'room. Wait with patience for its decision; and guard 'against proceedings which must hurt your temporal interest, 'and injure your consciences. Or, if any of you are already 'engaged in the confederacy of disorder, break the engage- 'ment of iniquity, whose ties cannot bind the conscience. '*The peace of God be with you all.*'

A discourse from a person of Doctor Woodward's credit and authority, would have been of infinite consequence in the beginning. Or a pastoral letter, with an open discountenance of the interchange of *religious visits* would have been productive of the most salutary effects. *Principis obsta sero medicina paratur*, hold good in politics as well as in physic.

One pastoral letter or sermon in eighty-five, would have been worth a thousand pamphlets in eighty-seven, and few

persons are so well qualified for such a part of the pastoral charge as the Lord Bishop of Cloyne, had he been as intent upon the discharge of that office which Saint Paul enjoins on pastors, *preach the word, be instant in season;* as his Lordship was intent on writing a pamphlet *out of season.*

I should never blame Doctor Woodward for writing a pamphlet in favour of tithes, which (if I am well informed,) bring him an income of eight or nine hundred a year. But he could have written his pamphlet without reviving old controversies, and bringing the Catholics and Dissenters on the stage. Much less should he have made a personal attack on Mr. O'Leary, whom he might have left unnoticed. But leaving the Bishop in full possession of his tithes, which to me are matters of no concern, I must proceed in my defence.

Convinced that the Protestant gentlemen who were acquainted with the uprightness of my intentions, were willing to co-operate with my endeavours, which had no object but the preservation of public tranquility, when divine service was over, we conferred together; and presuming, with reason, that their resemblance of religious conformity, was but a mask which covered features, which when exposed to view would not exhibit an inviting aspect, we agreed to tear it off, and expose the wearers to their neighbours and themselves. I exhorted them to my utmost, in the most persuasive manner, adapted to the circumstances. The magistrates explained the laws with proper comments. The people recovered from their delusion, returned to their duty, fully determined to desist from those dangers and romantic enterprises, which have proved equally destructive to themselves and to the peace of the community, had not the law of God, which Mr. O'Leary explained, and the law of the land explained by the civil magistrate, checked the progress of their pernicious career.

Thus, with the concurrence of the Protestant gentlemen and magistrates, have I begun my mission in the diocese of Cloyne.—*Sedition*, with which mad malevolence has upbraided me, fled as a routed enemy before me; whilst peace, like the inseparable companion of a man framed by nature, and disciplined by habit to cast its shadow on every side, trod in my steps and humoured my motions. It embraced me so close

that the meridian sun could not discover us asunder. I challenge Doctor Woodward, or that infamous libeller, Theophilus, to disprove this assertion.

In the interim the Catholic prelates met in Cork, and framed those regulations so worthy of Apostles, who despise the grandeurs of this fleeting world, and *of whom the world is unworthy*.—The words of Saint Paul.

Their arrival dispensed me with any further trouble; and after bringing on my narrative so far, will dispense me in future with speaking so much of myself.—A personal attack required a personal defence; and as my conduct has been minutely censured, I have been under the necessity of entering into a minute detail. My enemies, or rather *the friends of tithes*, to which I have no call, have attempted to brand me with the stigma of *sedition*. Whoever reads my plain, unadorned narrative, without prejudice or partiality, will wipe away the mark of infamy.

Had the Bishop of Cloyne been as active in enforcing peace and subordination as I have done, the fire which kindled in his diocese, would not in all appearance have extended the conflagration.—Nor is his Lordship to take any offence at my freedom for making this remark. I only remind him of the obligations enjoined on him at his consecration, when he answered the following interrogatory. 'Will you maintain and set forward, as much as 'shall lie in you, quietness, love and peace among all men; 'and such as be unquiet, disobedient, and criminous, within 'your diocese, correct and punish? Answer.—I will do so 'by the help of God.'*

God and his own conscience can inform him how far his silence and inactivity have contributed to punish and correct the unquiet, disobedient, and criminous within his diocese, in a manner conformable to his pastoral charge, and to that gospel whose author preached nothing but glory to God, *and peace to men of good will on earth*. And the public are now the most competent to judge, how far his pamphlet has contributed to maintain and set forward quietness, love and peace among all men.

* The Consecration of Bishops in the English Liturgy.

Had he as a Pastor gone forth among his flock, or as the Historian done justice to all parties, he would have discovered several of his own sheep amongst the speckled flock of insurgents, and not confine them solely to a *Popish mob.* Were not they Protestants who proposed the oaths in the congregation at Clonakilty? Were not they Protestants who overrun the parishes of Affydown, Skibbereen, &c.? Were not they Protestants who headed a party of four hundred White-boys near Butterant? The most respectable criminals (if a criminal can be respectable) who was arraigned before the Judges on the Munster circuit, were Protestants. If from the county of Cork his Lordship had taken an excursion to the county of Kerry, he would find the truth of the assertion made by a gentleman who is both a clergyman and a magistrate, and who bears the happy character of uniting the qualities of the three orders in his person, the liberality of the gentleman, the charity of the clergyman, and the justice and uprightness of the magistrate. 'Many Protestants, (though I thank my God, mostly 'of the lower order,) says that gentleman, were engaged in 'tendering oaths, in procession by day, and in outrages by 'night, as any other description of men whatsoever. Nay, 'some of them were captains of these lawless corps, and 'have been obliged to fly from the prosecution that awaited 'them.'*

Who could have been more active in suppressing those tumults than my Lord Kenmare, a Roman Catholic nobleman, the tender father of the honest and industrious tenant, and the just avenger of the injured, without any partial regard to religious distinctions? Could the public expect a more honourable testimony of his conduct? or can there be a greater proof of the contempt in which the liberal-minded of all persuasions hold feuds and discontents on the score of religious creeds, than the following address of thanks voted to him by the clergy of the established religion?

* Short and Civil Answer to a Pamphlet, intitled, "An Address to the Nobility and "Gentry of Ireland."

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD VISCOUNT KENMARE, &c.

The Address of the Clergy of the Established Church, assembled at Tralee.

My Lord,

'We have seen with indignation the progress of a delu-
'sion, which affected in its object to controul the laws of the
'realm.—From the spreading contagion, every good citizen
'felt an encreasing alarm; and the tranquility of the country
'was suspended in the fever of the times.—You, my Lord,
'came forward in the crisis.—You led the way in zeal and
'in vigilance; and borrowing less from the station you pos-
'sess, than from the esteem you deserve, you interposed; an
'example which had a title to success; by such an exertion,
'and by the native energy of violated justice, we trust that
'the growing mischief has been effectually repelled. We
'owe you our acknowledgments, and in the hour of subsid-
'ing tumult, we thank you for the prospect of repose. To
'some minds there is a conscious satisfaction, which exceed
'every other measure of reward; yet, my Lord, to the testi-
'mony of your own feelings, you will not refuse to join the
'tribute of general applause.'

'MAURICE CROSBIE,

'Dean of Limerick, and Rector of Castle-Island, &c.'

Tralee, Oct. 4, 1786.

Can then any man in honour to conscience say with the unconscientious Theophilus, that the insurgents are all Papists? Or is it not a falsehood bordering upon blasphemy,* for that slanderer to say, 'that the parish Priests are in a 'confederacy with their flocks, in order to plunder the Pro-'testant clergy of their tithes, and to appropriate to them-'selves a *compensation for absolution?*' These Pastors have suffered more than any in the shipwreck.—Was not a Father

* Those words are not contradicted by the Bishop

Burke obliged to quit his parish, the same day that Archdeacon Tisdal quitted his? Were not balls fired at one Father Sheehy? Were not two clergymen, one a Secular, and the other Regular, robbed the same night of their wearing apparel? Another parish Priest, a venerable old man, who was never charged with any extortions, and who, in my own presence, challenged his congregation to bring forward any charge against him, was robbed of what little he had to support him in his old age, even of his very bed.—Another on suspicion of having brought the army to his congregation to prevent the deluded people from swearing, was on the point of being torn limb by limb at his altar, had not a gentleman stepped forward and said, that he himself was the person who had applied to the magistrate for the purpose. The gentleman himself narrowly escaped with his life, through the interposition of the Vicar-general, who had the presence of mind to step with the Crucifix in his hand between the gentleman and the enraged multitude, crying out to them with a loud voice, *I conjure you in the name of the God whose image I hold, not to pollute his altar with murder.*

Is it possible that a man could be so callous to the feelings of honour, and so impenetrable to the impressions of truth, as to obtrude on the public such barefaced slanders as Theophilus has done? Could not his zeal against Popery, and that unprovoked vengeance, the offspring of the Demons of night, be sufficiently glutted with the persecution which defenceless men suffer from their own, without blackening their character? Or could the Bishop of Cloyne, who is presumed not to be ignorant of transactions which happened both to his own and the other diocese committed to his care, excuse a Theophilus in saying with such *sang froid*, than an *apprehension for the safety of religion will naturally excite a warmth?* Will zeal for religion justify what nature and religion condemn? Or did the Bishop of Cloyne imagine that I would be so divested of honour, or such an enemy to my character, as not to cast a light upon the subject, when once his pamphlet in which I am so cruelly treated, would fall into my hands? The insurgents then were of every description of the lower orders. They made no distinction between the clergy of either religion, when once they became obnoxious to them.

Their creeds were different, but they all equally complained of tithes and tithe-jobbers, whom the Bishop in his great charity, calls the agents and servants of the clergy. I could add to the number of the persecuted Roman Catholic clergymen of this county, several against whom their parishioners swore, and whose masses they have not heard, in the long space of fourteen months.

There are powerful Protestant peers in the county of Cork: the Bishop of Cloyne by his profession is of the number.—And those persecuted, defenceless Roman Catholic clergymen had it not in their power to vote a grateful and well penned address to the most powerful of the noblemen of the county, for their favourable and timely interposition, as the Protestant clergy had voted one to the Catholic nobleman. No: the county of Cork is the only county in Ireland, where the temporal peer attacked a secular priest with the cane; and where the spiritual peer has made so extraordinary and unprovoked an attack on a regular clergyman with the pen.

Glorious triumphs indeed! and battles worthy to be recorded in histories, written in golden characters, in paper preserved with cedar juice. *Historiæ vere aureæ cedroque dignee.*

How far the Bishop of Cloyne's history would deserve such an honour, may be conjectured by his account of the insurrections, in which he enlarges on the persecutions of the Protestant clergy, without mentioning a word of the sufferings of the Catholic Pastors. He speaks of a *Popish mob.*—But why does he not speak out, and unfold the historical page, from one margin to the other?—Why does he leave so many blanks for me to fill up? Or as he attempted the tragedy of Orestes: when he placed the Protestant sufferers in the front, why did not he place the Catholic sufferers on the back of the page, and finish the piece? *Scriptus et intergo nectum finitus Orestes.* Did not the Catholic priest suffer as well as the Protestant minister, only that he had not so much to lose, nor the same expectation of being reimbursed? Was not the Catholic farmer as ill treated as the Protestant? Or were there two different sounds in *Captain Right's horn? arms were taken*

out of the hands of Protestants by the Bishop's account—and I ask him by whom? Is he sure that the hand that wrested them from the Protestants, had ever made the sign of the cross? Beds, clothes and money were taken from the Catholic clergy.—Who took them from those men to whom (according to the Bishop's favourite Theophilus,) *the Catholic laity are slaves?* I must however, do the Bishop the justice that he assigns as a partial cause of the insurrections 'the connivance of some members of the 'established church, the supineness of more, the timidity 'of the generality of magistrates, a corrupt encouragement 'of those lawless acts is not a few.' I am extremely thankful to him for this figure of rhetoric, called a climax. It is an evident confession on his part, that the gentlemen of the established church were under no apprehension of its danger, much less of the overthrow of the state *by a Popish mob.* But I am doubtful whether they will be so thankful to him for bringing them forward as confederates in the insurrections, by connivance and encouragement.—I entertain a better opinion of them. Their supineness then must have originated in a conviction that the poor cottagers and the griping tithe-jobbers did not stand upon favourable terms with each other: and that in the conflict for a potato or sheaf of corn, the Protestant gentlemen would not regret if the latter were worsted. They had their properties and consequence to hazard in case of a revolution.—And had their imaginations been haunted with the gloomy spectres which Doctor Woodward now raises all over the kingdom, they would have been more active and vigilant; though they have not read the Roman Pontifical with that attention which Doctor Woodward has bestowed on it, to find out the Catholic Bishop's consecration oath; yet common sense and the knowledge of the world informed them, that there was no danger of *the Protestant ascendancy*, from a *Popish mob*, *assisted by a foreign power.*

When Doctor Woodward promised in the title-page of his pamphlet, a *General account of the Insurrections in Munster*, we little expected a short martyrology of two or three pages, announcing threats to burn new churches, which are still

standing, and have no elements to resist but wind and rain: old churches to be changed into mass-houses, which have not yet been sprinkled with holy water; the tongues of clergymen to be cut out, which tongues have not yet lost their spring; and other alarming menaces, for which he acknowledges to have no other voucher, but a paper he received from Cork. Thus the boasting poet in Horace promised a mighty description of the feats and achievements performed before the walls of Troy. *Fortunam Priami cantabo et nobele bellum.*

The mountain was in labour (saith the Poet) and was delivered of a mouse.—From great promises of *a General Account of the Rise and Progress of the Insurrections in Munster*, we expected mighty matters. We expected that the dignified historian, would not be content with moistening the nib of his pen with a small drop of ink, without going deeper into his standish. We had room to expect that he would lay open the sources of information, do justice to all parties, and be religiously accurate in his descriptions. He talks of *a Popish mob, taking arms out of the hands of Protestants.—A Church nailed up.—A new Church threatened to be burnt, if an old Church was not left for the purpose of being changed into a mass-house*, 'and vestries controuled in such a manner as 'not to afford elements for the Communion, though the Ca-'tholics are excluded from having votes when these vestries 'are held.'—Those facts and the threats already mentioned, make up this interesting and 'general account of the rise 'and progress of the Insurrections in Munster.'—And from such facts who would not infer that the overthrow of the established religion was meditated by the Catholics. It must be the author's meaning and drift to create such a belief in the minds of his readers, or there is no meaning in what he writes.—Why does he not mention the chapels that were nailed up; the Catholic clergy who suffered; the reduction of their accustomed dues; the Protestants who headed the Insurgents; his own churches resorted to as so many asylums in order to elude the laws; the motives and springs of their different transactions; the rise of the evil, and the application of the remedy.

He informs us that *Donoughmore church was nailed up:* and leaves his readers to look at the nails without pointing out the hand that fastened them; after having so deeply impressed his mind with the terrors of *Popery*, as to make him guess that a Popish hand had raised the hammer.

The Bishop could not be ignorant of the circumstances which gave rise to this transaction. He knows that the Protestant clergyman of that parish was beloved in the place, and had a great number of powerful friends. The Bishop of Cloyne appointed another clergyman to officiate in his room. This was not agreeable to the parishioners: when the strange clergyman came on a Sunday morning to the church he found it nailed up. Let the reader draw the inference. The Bishop of Cloyne should have either not mentioned *the Church of Donoughmore*, or not omitted this circumstance, which would either lead his reader into a knowledge that either the Protestant parishioners nailed up the church, or if there were any Catholics amongst them, that it was not from a design to invade the church, but from a love for the clergyman who was to quit the parish. But this manner of relating facts would not answer Doctor Woodward's end: he mentions a clergyman at whom *stones were thrown whilst he was officiating, and who would have been murdered by a neighbouring* Popish Congregation, *but for a messenger who was dispatched from the same congregation to inform him of the danger.* I am not a person of such a cavilling disposition as to deny facts, except when I have sufficient evidence to disprove them. But if the Bishop had related all the circumstances relative to the above transactions, the reader would attribute it to some cause different from the design of a popish confederacy to overturn the established church.

In relating this transaction, which a Catholic would hold in the same detestation in which a Protestant would hold it, has the Lord Bishop, as a candid historian, informed his readers that previous to this insult there had been an unhappy affray? A warrant which the parishioners of both religions deemed illegal, had been issued in order to levy church rates, after a manner to which the parishioners had not been accustomed. As far as I have been informed, the

rates were to be levied on plough-lands, instead of having recourse to the usual mode. The people resisted, and in the resistance two of the parishioners unfortunately lost their lives. The killers were indicted for murder. The bills were ignored: this exasperated the people: their minds still in a ferment—a new clergyman was sent to officiate in the parish: they were more disposed in favour of his predecessor: whilst the clergyman was reading his prayers, a boy, perhaps a son to one of the men who had been killed, began to throw stones, and was immediately hindered. As to the fact that the men were killed, I appeal to the Lord Bishop of Cloyne himself, who would not have been glad that the affair would have been brought at that time before the Court of King's Bench, as bloodshed on the score of *consecrated goods*, has ever wounded the clerical profession in every age, and in every nation: as to the circumstances, I am not acquainted with the minute detail of them. For the truth of the above account, I appeal to the Protestant gentlemen in the neighbourhood of Ballivoorna, when he talks of the reduction of the tithes in the foregoing district. The Bishop and I relate the same facts, but our inferences are different. He relates bare facts, without mentioning one single circumstance which may determine the reader's judgment in favour of an injured and misrepresented people. His only object through the course of his pamphlet, is to prove what no man of sense in Ireland believes, viz. *the Church of Ireland is at this present moment in imminent danger of subversion.*

If facts such as are related by the Bishop were really believed, they certainly would be very alarming. But when related with their concomitant circumstances, and the motives that gave them rise, the phantom vanishes. The candid reader will infer from the above fact, that the attack on the clergyman was not a Popish confederacy against the established religion, but an ebulition of passion occasioned by resentment. When Pope Alexander the Sixth, ordered six cardinals to be sewed up in a bag, and cast into the Tyber, none but a fool can imagine that it was with a view to overthrow their religion; and no wise man will construe into a plot against the church, two or three stones thrown at a clergyman by a boy, after seeing the mangled body of his

father stretched dead in a field, in consequence of ecclesiastical dues, however unjustifiable the insult. The Lord Bishop of Cloyne must certainly have piercing eyes when he discovers *every one's religion in a crowd:* or when he confounds all religions concerned in the South, and amalgamates or unites them into one *Popish mass:* we can literally apply to the Historian of the Whiteboys, the remark made on Cambden, who from partiality to his nation, had both eyes open when he wrote of the English, one eye shut when he wrote of the Scotch, but was *quite blind when he wrote of the Irish.*

> Angligenus oculis perlustras Camdenne duobus;
> Monoculus Scotos: Cæcus Hibernos.

Hitherto the Lord Bishop has kept me at the doors of his church. Now let us follow him into the sanctuary—he talks of *Vestries being intimidated by the Whiteboys from granting money for the purchase of elements for the Holy Communion.*

How many Vestries have they intimidated? Or was this intimidation a Popish confederacy, to overturn the established religion by extinguishing fervour and devotion? I do not perceive this extraordinary zeal for the Sacraments in either Catholics or Protestants, which gives the ministers of religion room to complain of the great consumption of sacramental wine, and consecrated bread. The more they see their instructors attached to the world, the contempt of which they are bound to enforce; the more they see them intent upon blowing the trumpet of religious war, on the score of speculative tenets, which surpass the comprehension of the multitude, and neglect charity, peace, and humanity, which are within the reach of all; the more the laity perceive the ministers of a religion which is the offspring of heaven, intent upon fixing *its root in the earth*, the more they will relax in their fervour, and be inclined to believe that the sacred ministry is a kind of craft in the hands of skilful interested men, who for the sake of lucre and emolument, would preach up Christ in Europe, and Diana at Ephesus, had they lived in the time of Demetrius, the silver-smith, who complained that his trade would be lost if the temple of the Goddess was deserted. His Lordship knows that these are the obloquies and reproaches of our modern deists and free-thinkers.

He knows that in every age, people have availed themselves of obloquies and reproaches against the clergy, and alleged them as a cause of separation from his church, as well as from mine. The best method of silencing the voice of obloquy raised against the ministers of religion, is a conduct marked with that charity and disinterestedness which the public are entitled to expect from persons of their sacred functions. How far the Bishop of Cloyne's pamphlet has contributed to vindicate the clerical profession from the aspersions of obloquy, and to prove that the ministers of the Gospel are the most charitable and disinterested mortals on earth, let his readers judge. He is a minute historian who is not satisfied with informing his readers that the White-boys *intimidated Vestries from collecting Church rates*, without alarming the piety of the devoutest souls, by threatening them with a spiritual famine from Popish plunderers, who deprive them of the elements for the Holy Communion.

If the Lord Bishop of Cloyne had been as accurate in the enumeration of all the transactions of the Munster peasantry, as he has been in his detail of churches and elements, more figures would rise to view on his historical canvas, and in the groupe would appear *persecuted priests and deserted chapels.* He has painted one side of the face and shadowed the other. It is incumbent on me to supply the defect. He has given the profile, I must draw the face in full. My readers will excuse my prolixity when they are acquainted with my motives, and the reasons which induce me to enter into so minute a detail.

The character of the nation has been injured in foreign countries, where we are considered as in a state of barbarism and rebellion, in consequence of the exaggerated accounts industriously circulated in the prints, since the beginning of the disturbances. The Lord Bishop of Cloyne's pamphlet has been read at St. James's; and his Majesty must entertain an extraordinary opinion of the Dissenters and Catholics of Ireland. The Irish Catholics in particular, are objects of detestation all over Great Britain, in consequence of Theophilus's address, the *marrow* of which is inserted in the Monthly Review, which fell into my hands the day I sat

down to write this defence. In that Review of January, eighty-seven, the disturbances in Ireland are the result of a Popish confederacy, cemented 'by Popish clergymen, and 'their votaries, with a design to overturn the established re- 'ligion. All these misfortunes flow from a relaxation of the 'Popery laws, as from their genuine source,' &c. &c.

I am then indispensably bound to undeceive the pubic both in Ireland and wherever this pamphlet may appear. Justice to my country, to the Irish Catholics, and to myself, requires an exact and minute detail.

A pitched battle, in which ten thousand on each side had fallen in the field, has not employed so many pens, nor occasioned such alarms, as the mighty excursions of Captain Right's forces. They disturbed the peace of the community, it is true; and for this they are justly censured, and justly punishable. They collected money in two or three places, for the support of their confederates who were in goal. No person exculpates them for this ill-directed benevolence; and if they forced it from the people whose relations were in goal, they deserved death. There was one man cruelly and barbarously murdered in the county of Tipperary: at this murder humanity shudders; there was a respectable clergyman of the established church, the Rev. Mr. Ryan, most cruelly used; the Rev. Mr. Hare, was way-laid and escaped. In the county of Cork, the Rev. Doctor Atterbury, was forced to swear to the Right-boys table of tithe-rates, but received no other injury; the Rev. Mr. Mayne had some of his out-houses burned; the Rev. Mr. Kenny, from terror quitted his habitation; and Archdeacon Tisdal, with Father Burke, the priest of the parish, in which both resided, took shelter in Cork; the Rev. Mr. Browne had two or three horses cropped: these gentlemen are the clergymen of the established church, who were most materially injured. There was not a sensible Catholic in the county of Cork that did not condemn and detest the usage given to the Rev. Gentlemen now mentioned, and the more so, as some of them are considered as fathers to the poor; though the Lord Bishop of Cloyne upbraids me with uttering panegyrics on some of the Protes-

tant clergy. But equally indifferent to his applause, or censure, I shall ever pay a tribute to merit. Sorry am I, as an Historian and a man of feeling, that he has not enumerated the Catholic clergymen, who were equal sufferers in the storm. His readers would then be of opinion, that the Rightboys were as hostile to the Church of Rome, as to the established religion.

In the long space of fifteen months, whilst the disturbances continued, until the Earl of Carhampton, (then Lord Luttrell) came to Munster, I heard of no murder committed by the Whiteboys; if there has been any such barbarity committed, I shall relate it in the second edition of my pamphlet.

Every robbery, every outrage has been attributed to those deluded and unhappy people: and to my surprise, (if surprised I would be, after so many falsehoods propagated from the county where I reside,) on my arrival in Dublin, what should I see but an account of four hundred Whiteboys attacking officers of the army near Cork. Three nights before I set off from Cork, we had an account of this extraordinary encounter: an officer on his return from the sports of the field, for want of other game, shot a peasant's dog; before he had time to charge his piece, the active clown with his stick, revenged the death of the guardian of his cabin. This brought on an affray which was construed into Whiteboyism; and had there not been a Whiteboy or a Rightboy in the world, *touch me*, *touch my dog* would be a standing maxim with an Irish peasant; he commonly answers one question with another, and returns *blow for blow:* this last part of his education he receives from the instinct of nature, which is forwarded by the Irish soil, so favourable to the growth of valour. If he was guilty of no other fault but that of resenting an unprovoked injury, with a stroke of *Shilelah*, the nobility and gentry of Ireland would not blame him much. They themselves are remarkable for bravery; and their character is not to be insulted with impunity.

Far be it from me to countenance disorder, but I must make allowance for the passions of man; and I feel when I see every trifling scuffle magnified into *rebellion against the*

state, and every murmer against a proctor or tithe-jobber exaggerated into a *confederacy against the Church*. Yet to the discredit of the county of Cork in particular, every dwarf is metamorphosed into a giant. Tithe-jobbers strained every nerve to alarm the fears of Government, in order to secure themselves in their extortions, by painting the deluded peasantry as unworthy of the least compassion. In the Reverend author of the letter found on the road between Cork and Cloghnakilty, addressed to Dr. O'Leary, they found a favourite Historian, who, in peasants going before day for sand to manure their spots of ground, could discover Orlandos and Orsons. The sport of school-boys was magnified into sieges. In Monkstown, where ladies and gentlemen pass a good part of the summer for the benefit of bathing, what uproars and alarms: two wags, for the sake of diversion sounded an old horn in the dead of the night, and threw all the ladies and gentlemen into a panic terror. In the space of three weeks this nocturnal sport appeared in the distant prints a serious blockade by Captain Right, at the head of five hundred men; in this manner, at a distance from the scene of action, were numbers alarmed at the report of the *taking of Umbrage*.* To give a history of the false accounts propagated in the public papers, and of the manœuvres of tithe-dealers, would be an endless task: I must hasten to the vestries, as the Lord Bishop of Cloyne complains that they were intimidated from purchasing the elements for the holy communion.

I have heard but of one vestry in his diocese relative to which there has been any intimidation. The people who complained of tithes complained of the rise of the parish rates, and requested the gentleman who had the superintendance of the vestry, not to increase them. In the year eighty, church-rates in some parts of the diocese of Cloyne, were but 1*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* The people, both Protestants and Catholics, finding that their piety did not increase in proportion to the

* As the words require an explanation, for the instruction of several, it is fit to remark, that when it was reported in the papers that the French had taken Umbrage at the proceedings of the English, some wiseacres imagined that Umbrage was the name of some great city. The mistake of the meaning of a word often leads into error: and of this error are guilty those who confound Whiteboyism with a Popish Confederacy.

rapid rise of the ecclesiastical revenues, and that the clergy were not more holy and disinterested in the year eighty-six, than they were in the year eighty, thought fit that sanctity should not be distanced by so many odds by the price of sanctification. They brought both within nearer view of each other, and hence this mystery of popery controuling vestries, and depriving souls who did not choose to pay too much for their canonization, is unravelled. With regard to the notice ordering a church to be left for a mass-house, and threats to burn a new one, I ridiculed the very idea of it in my last address to the Whiteboys. He says that they bound themselves by oath, in presence of the church-wardens, to burn the new church, if the old one was not left for a mass-house. Who were those who bound themselves by oath to commit such a deed? Does his church-wardens know them? If he does, let him bring them to justice? If he does not know them, how does he know their religion? And have they fulfilled their engagement? Was mass said in the old church? Is the new church burnt? It is very likely that a set of men who have not heard prayers from their own pastors in the long space of fourteen months, and who had flocked to his churches, for the sake of impunity, would (as I remarked in my letter to them) indulge such fervour as to have a church for a mass-house, and die martyrs for prayers. *Apago nugec!*

If the Bishop of Cloyne believes this a serious affair, I applaud him for the strength of his faith. Under the apprehensions of terror the imagination realizes phantoms. We read in history that armies in the dead of the night encamped on the summit of a hill, imagining that the enemies were drawn up in battle array in a distant plain.* The out-scouts at the dawn of day discovered, to their surprise, that it was an extensive field covered with overgrown thistles, nodding with the breeze, and seeming to beckon to their pursuers to advance. Doctor Woodward's imagination creates similar foes. Nor can we discover any danger to Doctor Woodward's *old church or new church*, except what he figures to himself in his pamphlet.

* The army of the princes in the reign of Louis the Eleventh. See Father Daniel's History of France.

But will Mr. O'Leary deny that such notices were posted up, and such letters, threatening to cut out tongues, &c. were written? By no means: Mr. O'Leary is not a man to controvert facts vouched by the Bishop's authority, except when he has facts to counterbalance them. In that case he will humbly take the liberty of being guided by his own judgment. He does not believe the Pope's infallibility; much less will he place infallibility in the Bishop of Cloyne's oracles when he delivers them from his tripod. But he is humbly of opinion that such notices and letters came from other quarters. Tithe-proctors, tithe-jobbers, and others were interested in alarming the nation, and awakening the fears of Government. They dreaded the least alteration in the present system, and knew that the best method to secure success to their plan, was to blacken as much as possible deluded men who were already but too obnoxious. Hence the exaggerated accounts of the Whiteboys circulated in the distant prints; all provisions, and every communication between town and country cut off. Yet our markets were supplied as usual.

A lady of consequence, who spends her time and income in encouraging arts and manufactures, on whose estate the little girl of five earns her bread by knitting; whose tenants wear shoes and stockings, clean shirts and warm frize, whilst the tenants of several are shivering with cold and pinching with hunger; who, when the peasant dies, gives the warm cabin, and a spot of ground rent-free to the widow and orphans, until the eldest son is able to provide for them; who has diffused a spirit of industry and vigour amongst the naked and unemployed inhabitants of barren rocks; and who, like another Zenobia, has a manly heart in a female breast.——This lady intended to drain part of a lake, in order to enlarge her improvements. A grateful peasantry flocked to the work. It was enough. We soon read in distant papers that a *thousand Whiteboys* had thrown up intrenchments, and had formed a regular encampment upon her lands. Numberless falsehoods have been industriously propagated, to the dishonour of the country. No honest man would justify any breach of the public peace, and no man who pays any regard for justice or truth would propagate falsehoods and infamy.

Before the relaxation of the Popery laws, a wretch, after having quitted his house, set fire to it in the dead of the night, and swore to damages which were to be made good to him at the expense of the innocent. The villany was proved in open court. Had the Lord Bishop of Cloyne made enquiries, perhaps he would find that some tithe-jobbers tampered with their hirelings to set fire to their own corn.—By this manœuvre they expected that a tenfold gain would compensate for this wilful loss. I doubt not then the reality of the notices, however absurd, nor the threats, however unlikely to be carried into execution. But I suspect the quarter from whence they came. Interest and vengeance combined, are capable of giving greater alarms, but the judgment must not be captivated to the yoke of an implicit belief, when the motives of credibility are dubious; and anonymous letters are bad vouchers. No man intent upon the murder of another, ever forewarns him of the danger. If a person wrote me a letter, threatening to cut out my tongue, I would not be under the least apprehension that he would deprive me of the organ of speech. If he were in earnest, he would watch his opportunity without putting me on my guard. Be this as it may, we all deplore the peace of society disturbed; the property of individuals injured by nightly excursions, and the distraction of the community.

But the duty of the historian confines him within the limits of truth, and in relating events when he cannot know the real causes, he must assign the most probable. The Bishop's favourite layman, talks of *people hanging in gallowses*, noses and ears *cut off*, *&c.* Will the Bishop of Cloyne be his voucher. For while I am on the spot, I shall controvert the legendary tales of any modern Sir John Temple.—No; the Bishop cannot produce one single instance of any man's being murdered by the Whiteboys, in the counties of Cork or Kerry, and as for noses, had he discovered any of them to be cut off by the Whiteboys, his zeal for religion would have induced him to collect and fix them in *the face* of his pamphlet to ornament his *picture of persecution*, and give it its due proportions. I enquired about those *noses* and

ears, I can get no information. The operations then of a campaign of fifteen months, (a campaign, which has attracted the attention of all Europe, thanks to our tithe journalists,) have confined, as I remarked before, to two or three proctors, buried without being dead, and rising immediately without waiting for the sound of the last trumpet; the burning of some few ricks of corn, and the cropping of nine or ten garrans which are still at the plough; and notabene, the two last garrans that were cropped after Lord Luttrell's first excursion to Munster, though the oldest in studd, were cropt with as much nicety as if a young miss's ears were to be pierced for the reception of ornamental pendants. A small flit! *but great noise.* Such is the number of the wounded by the Whiteboys in the counties of Cork and Kerry: but where is the number of the slain? The slain and mortally wounded were the deluded *bipeds*, whom the Bishop of Cloyne did not exhort, nor banish from his churches; and who goaded by oppression on one hand, and the expecting impunity from hypocrisy on the other, gave into those wild and extravagant measures against which Mr. O'Leary cautioned them. During the disturbances, the Catholic clergy and laity suffered more than their Protestant neighbours of the same respective orders. And when the Lord Bishop of Cloyne promised his readers a *general account of the rise and progress of the insurrections in Munster*, we little expected that his account would be inclosed in a nutshell, of which five or six Protestant clergymen were the kernel, whilst the persecuted Catholic clergymen are omitted, as the withered leaves of the tree, left out of his historical dessert.

Such is the plain, candid, and unadorned account of the disturbances, in the suppression of which I have taken so active a part, whilst the Lord Bishop of Cloyne, as an unconcerned spectator, stood gazing upon an eminence at a great distance from the field of battle. After a large fabric has been on fire for more than twelve months, it is laudable in him to come forward with the doleful news, that a few rafters have been burnt. He should have been the first to put his hand to the engine, in order to bring the fire under, and to prevent it from communicating to the adjacent buildings.

When the prophet Jeremiah wrote his Lamentations, it was a long time before the destruction of Jerusalem, in order to caution the people, and induce them to guard against the impending calamity. When the prophet Ezekiel had eaten a book in which were written *lamentations, and a song, and woe*, it was to forewarn an obstinate people. But when the Bishop of Cloyne cries aloud from the walls of Jerusalem, *the church of Ireland is at this present moment in imminent danger of subversion*, it is after the Chaldeans had raised the siege and retired to their country; fifteen months after the disturbances had broken out; after Lord Kenmare, a Catholic peer had suppressed them in Kerry; after the Lord Chief Baron Yelverton had decreed an atonement to violated justice, by the punishment of such criminals as were found guilty of a breach of the laws; and after the Earl of Carhampton (then Lord Luttrell) had pacified the entire province, a few stragglers excepted. If in the long space of fifteen months he was really convinced that the vessel, of the established religion, of which he is one of the pilots, was in danger, why has he slept at the helm? When the storm is over and the sea exhibits a smooth surface, he sings the doleful ditty of the shipwrecked mariner all over the three kingdoms; but where was he when the ship was on the point of sinking? Where was the pastoral letter? Where was the pathetic address? Where was the publication replete with those figures and images which would work on the passions of the Protestant nobility and gentry of the province, and awaken them to a sense of their danger? It is no great hardship for a bishop to publish a pamphlet in eighty-seven, which he had all the leisure to write in the year eighty-six. But where were the exertions of the pastoral care? Where was the shepherd's whistle heard, when the wolf was devouring the flock? The Bishop of Cloyne acknowledges that the diocese of Cork was committed to his care in the absence of Doctor Mann. This additional charge to that of his own diocese should naturally have redoubled his vigilance: he then should have made it his business as superintendant of such extensive dioceses, to get every information relative to the disorders which distracted the places committed to his care, to endeavour to

stifle the evil in its birth, and to prevent its spreading any further.

I shall make no further comments, but leave my readers to their own judgment, without anticipating their reflections. However the learned may admire Tacitus for his art in raising a rich work from poor materials, his judicious reflections, and concise (though obscure) manner of impressing his sentiments; yet he shall never take him for my guide, because he is too malignant, and ascribes the most casual events to a dark policy. If Augustus names Tiberius for his successor, it is according to Tacitus, with a design that the vices of that tyrant should serve as a foil to set off his own qualities. If Piso is appointed governor of such a province, it is in order to be a spy over Germanicus, whom Tiberius envied. If Sejanius is elected prime minister, it is in order to glut the vengeance of the gods: he ascribes the offspring of chance to a gloomy destiny: his characters generally bear the same features: it is not the man whom he describes, but the historian's heart I read: for this very reason I do not like him, because he distorts the objects. Had the same events happened in his time at Rome which have happened within those fifteen months in the county where I reside, what a *political picture* would not Tacitus have left to future ages! The plebians all up in arms, and the supreme Augur asleep without consulting the Omens! The temples of the gods threatened with destruction, and the Pontiff silent! And when the danger is over, the empire in commotion, and the Pontiff offering propitiatory sacrifices and inviting the people to burn incense, in order to avert those calamities from which the gods had delivered them, during his security and somnolence! Reflections of the kind I leave to such historians as Tacitus or to the Lord Bishop of Cloyne himself, who is so ingenious as to metamorphose me into a being to which I bear no resemblance, and to cast me in a mould so ill fitted to my frame.

Can any person in his senses presume that the Catholics of Ireland, after the late indulgence extended to them by the reigning powers, would be so divested of gratitude and common sense as to expose their necks to the chain with which

rigorous laws had bound them for so many years.—When their ancestors signed the capitulation of Limerick, and submitted to the son-in-law of their former fugitive and cowardly king, sooner than violate the laws of nations, afterwards so basely violated by the last of the Stuarts, they declined availing themselves of the succours sent by Lewis the Fourteenth. When Alberoni sent the son of James the Second to Scotland, the Irish Catholics remained quiet and peaceful, though they had every reason to expect the assistance of Spain if they joined the son of their former king, when the present family was not sufficiently settled on a throne threatened by foreign foes, and an aspiring candidate who had his father's title to plead, and numbers of his partizans, each to join him in support of his pretensions. When the plains of Fontenoy were dyed with English blood, and George the Second threatened with expulsion from the British dominions, by a young pretender marching to the seat of empire, where was any commotion amongst the Catholics of Ireland? When Thurot landed at Carrickfergus where were the Catholics who flocked to his banners in the North? Where were the Catholics who caused a diversion in his favour in the South? When England was surrounded by a warring world; one of her strongest limbs torn from her body, by the loss of America; her fleets pursued by a victorious enemy, displaying their flag on her coasts; and Ireland, destitute of any assistance but the loyalty and courage of her sons, who forgot their unhappy and fatal prejudices in the common danger, did the Irish Catholics stand by as neutral spectators, in expectation of the event? Did not they flock to the standard of their Protestant neighbours, and march at the signal, either to defend their common country, or to mingle their blood in the same trenches with their fellow-subjects? Are those the men whose loyalty should be suspected, and character traduced? Or must the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's clamour about tithes become now a wakeful trump to thunder division amongst three bodies of men, who in time of danger were consolidated into one? He alarms the members of the established church with the danger wherewith they are threatened from the Dissenters inclined to pull it down. He alarms

them with the danger wherewith they are threatened from the Catholics ready to set up their own. He excludes both from national confidence; then shifts the ground, and after having discarded the Dissenters as hostile to his establishment, he invites them to his standard, to join him in his attack upon the Catholics, by reminding them of the lenient usage they met with from his church, when compared with the severe usage they would meet with from the church of Rome.

The Lion invited one day the beasts to a hunting party, and promised to divide the spoils: the ass with his loud notes roused the game, which was soon run down: the division of the spoil commenced—this belongs to me said the Lion, according to compact; and this because my name is Lion, and this for such a reason; and who would dare to touch the rest? One would imagine that Æsop had read the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's pamphlet. 'Come Dissenters to my 'assistance, though I have excluded you before from national 'confidence, enemies to my establishment, which from prin-'ciple you are inclined to pull down, become my auxiliaries 'in chaining your fellow-subjects of the Catholic persuasion, 'lest they reach their hands to the sacred sheaf. But, as for 'you, you dare not touch it, for my name is Lion.' The Lord Bishop of Cloyne would have some colourable pretence for alarming the fears of Irish Dissenters, and prejudicing them against their Catholic fellow-subjects, if he had the generosity to divide the spoils. But will he divide the *tithes* with their clergy? His invitation then and his compliments are equally unmeaning.

Heavens forbid, that the natives of this kingdom (let their religion be what it may) should ever relapse into the frenzy of destructive and unchristian dissensions.

The Dissenters then will say to the Lord Bishop of Cloyne, 'we will support the State, not in compliance with your *cha-'ritable admonition*, but because it is our duty and interest. 'Be we will not make war upon our neighbours for tithes 'and mitres; we shall not efface from the pannels of the Lord 'Bishop of Cloyne's carriage, that emblem of ecclesiastical 'pre-eminence he has borrowed from the Church of Rome, 'which he is now exposing to public detestation;' nor dimi-

nish the number of his dishes, which the Catholic clergy had dressed for him, ages before they imagined that Bishops, instead of praying for them and their successors, would disturb the dead in their graves, by attributing to them doctrines they never taught, and exciting the jealousy and resentment of the reigning powers against the living, by casting at their thresholds abortives they disclaim. We shall not engage, my Lord Bishop of Cloyne, in a Crusade to make war upon infidels who are not in possession of your Holy Land.

It is extraordinary in you to alarm the public, with the dangers of Popery, when you retain the most oppressive part of a religion, from which you are sprung, tithes that are oppressive to the poor, and pre-eminence which in all ages has not been well relished by the rich. We cannot in reason hate a Catholic for his speculative creed. His belief of the real presence affects us no more than if he believed that Berenices tresses were changed into a comet: nor are we much concerned whether in that immensity beyond the grave, there may be an intermediate place between the two extremes of complete happiness and complete misery. A place where the soul attones for venial lapses, and pays off a part of the debts it has contracted here. It is equal to us where a man pays his debts, whether here or in purgatory, provided he pays ourselves what he owes us. And however clamourous a mitred divine may be about a Popish purgatory, *he may perhaps go further, and speed worse.*

The proctor's pound where the cottager's cow or calf is imprisoned, is a greater nuisance to the living, than thousands of subterraneous caverns beyond the grave. When you call upon us then to your assistance against our Catholic neighbours, we shall not obey the summons, until you divide with us the spoils of piety which have been transmitted to you by the Catholic clergy, whom you are now attacking. When they were groaning under the yoke of penal laws, we published at Dungannon those resolutions which Europe read with admiration; in them we declared, that as we held freedom of conscience sacred in ourselves, so we held it sacred in others, and gloried in the

prospect of our Catholic fellow-subjects' emancipation. America copied after the illustrious example. The Emperor has placed the God-like image of toleration, in the same banner with the Imperial Eagle. Good sense and the general good of society, are restoring to unhappy morals the inalienable charter, which school divinity had usurped, the choice of the religion they think the best; and the privilege of being accountable to God alone for their speculative tenets. Any person who would preach or practise a contrary doctrine, is an *agitator* indeed, and an agitating Bishop is as obnoxious to us as an *agitating Friar*. You have directed your arrows against Mr. O'Leary in particular: he has washed off the paint which your brush has laid on his face: he has proved in his narrative, that you have not given an accurate account of the disturbances in Munster; you have not stemmed the torrent—you have not assigned the genuine causes of the insurrections, which in your heart you know not to have originated in any Popish confederacy against either church or state, but in the despair of wretchedness, ascribable indeed to several causes, amongst which tithes and tithe-canters are to be enumerated. Mr. O'Leary has fully justified the Catholic body from the foul aspersion of Theophilus and the insinuation of the Lord Bishop of Cloyne. He has called on you both, to produce one agitating Friar, or Romish Missionary sent here to sow sedition, or who has sown sedition in the land. There is the challenge given by conscious innocence. We shall not then quarrel with our Catholic neighbours, much less with Mr. O'Leary: if he has any more to say we shall hear him: it is the privilege to which every injured man is entitled; but we consider him as fully acquitted, whatever further remarks he may think fit to make on your pamphlet.

SECTION THE SECOND,

Containing a vindication of Mr. O'Leary's address to the Whiteboys.

I KNOW not upon what ground the Lord Bishop of Cloyne can say that my addresses are most artfully contrived to sow

sedition? Is it for recommending peace? No. Is it for recommending patience under sufferings? If so, the Lord Bishop of Cloyne must burn the Bible. Is it because I did not enlarge upon the miseries of the peasantry, in consequence of low wages and rack-rents, as the Bishop intimates? The reduction of tithes and the dues of the parish priests were the only objects mentioned in the insurgents' proclamations. In addressing them upon complaints which they did not express, was to represent the orator who finished, by the deluge, his sermon on the resurrection. The public knew the people were exasperated and outrageous. I had one object in view, which was to work on their passions, by the fittest springs, to move the hearts and allay the passions of a discontented multitude. I mean hope and fear; the dread of punishment, and the hope of redress—I knew that such of the clergy as, from the warmth of zeal, and want of foreknowledge that their flock would ever rise against themselves, had recourse to the usual method of reclaiming them by severity, had lost their influence. In vain had they substituted a curse for a prayer, and the oak saplin for the peaceful asperges; the obstinacy of the flock increased in proportion to the rigour of the pastor; at last the rupture rose to such a height, that they swore in some places never to hear prayers from their present parish priests.——This the Lord Bishop of Cloyne cannot be ignorant of; and the candour of the historian, when he talks of the insurrections, as well as justice to those persecuted ecclesiastics, should have induced him to advert to this very singular and unexpected circumstance; especially when he had read in the slanderous Theophilus the false and infamous charge brought against those clergymen, accusing them of being in a confederacy with their flocks for the overthrow of the church and state. It was not from want of zeal and loyalty that they miscarried in their attempt to re-establish order. In all probability they would have succeeded better, had they tempered their fire.

I had to guard against the inconvenience which proved a stumbling-block to others. I knew that oil smooths the ruffled sea, and that a long time before Cicero and Quintilian

had laid down rules for rhetoricians to work on the passions, Solomon, a greater adept in the knowledge of the human heart, had said, *A soft answer breaketh anger, and a hard word raiseth up fury.* In my two first publications I addressed them in the soft language of sympathy; led them on, step by step, to the temple of hope, at whose gates they should wait with patience, keeping at a distance from the precipices which surround its confines, violence from despair, and licentiousness from presumption. All parties acknowledge they were wretched; the clergy knew it, and they blamed the landlord; the landlords knew it, and they blamed the clergy's agent. It was not my duty to dictate to either; but if the Lord Bishop of Cloyne affirms, in his pamphlet, that they did not suffer from such persons as deal in tithes, with every deference he should be better informed. A gentleman of veracity has declared to me that thirty-two shillings have been extorted for one acre of potatos; and that when a peasant offered to buy his tithes at a certain price, he was horse-whipped: I do not say that this happened in the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's diocese, to which he should have confined himself when he became an advocate for ecclesiastical agents: and if report be true, in some places it is said that the tithes which were set by the clergyman for three hundren pounds, were raised by those harpies to the enormous sum of £700, and more. This rapid rise must have been oppressive to the poor, without any benefit, but rather a loss to the clergyman: the Bishop of Cloyne would have done well if, in the beginning of the disturbances, and even a long time before, he had inquired, whether there had been in his own diocese a certain tithe-jobber of such art, power, and influence, as to get the tithes for about one hundred and sixty pounds, which he raised to about five hundred. The clergyman, who is all sweetness and humanity, was under the necessity, in his own defence, to make over a bond to this *agent*, who had the policy and influence to hinder the peasants from taking the tithes from the lenient and lawful owner, who was willing to set them at a moderate price. But when, by the above stratagem, this man got them into his own possession, they became the scourges of the poor, who were continually

harassed by decrees, either real or fictitious, which he either obtained or pretended to obtain from the Bishop's-Court. No music could be heard in his district but the noise of cattle, mingled with the cries of the wretched, seeing their little stock sold for half value. That man's pound was like unto a lion's den. The oppressed people came to the clergyman requesting him to take the tithes into his own hands, offering him twenty pounds more than he got from the jobber; an offer which the clergyman who feels for the poor, was under the painful necessity of refusing, on account of his engagement with the other. All parties then agree that the unhappy people were oppressed: and the Earl of Carhampton (then Lord Viscount Luttrell) who commanded the army in Munster, and who acquitted himself of his commission with such honour and humanity, is convinced that distress, but not wantonness; the stings of poverty, but not the design of overturning church or state, gave rise to the disturbances in the South of Ireland. Had the maxim that *it is better to prevent crimes than to punish them*, been followed; had all the landlords, both noblemen and getlemen taken an active part at the first breaking out of the insurrections; had they explained to their respective tenants the danger and impropriety of their proceedings, inquired into their complaints, informed them that the senate of the nation was alone competent to make any alteration in established laws, and that if they did not follow their advice, or obey their injunctions, they would be under the necessity of punishing them, both as landlords and magistrates; had this plan been adopted, the disturbances would have been stifled in their very birth. Such of the gentlemen of consequence as had adopted this plan, soon restored peace and tranquillity to their districts. It was the plan which Menenius Agrippa adopted with success, when the discontented plebeians retired to the sacred mountain. It was the plan adopted by Junius Blesus, when the Pannonian legions revolted at the instigation of a common soldier. It was the plan adopted by Lord Luttrell when he went to the congregations, and reclaimed to their duty several parishes, instead of marking the progress of his march with the impoverished blood of half-starved wretches. Cæsar's clemency outshone the splendour of his victories. And Lord Lut-

trell's wisdom and humanity upon that occasion, besides the honour and esteem he acquired, have contributed more to the restoration of order and tranquillity, than if he had let the army loose, and begun with coercion and violence.

The ministry of a clergyman, is a ministry of charity and compassion; when I see then, heroes bred in camps, and trained up amidst the clash of arms, sheath upon several occasions the sword, and hold out the olive branch; when in the cure of wounds, lenitives are preferred to caustics, I am not ashamed for having addressed a discontented and oppressed people, in the style of sympathy and tenderness. But when I see a Prelate, whose very robes are by their institution emblematical of extensive charity, exhibit symptoms of joy in the expectation that the poor will not be relieved by their rulers, I should be more inclined to curse the priesthood than to revere it; if I were so blind as to confound the unfeelingness and other defects of the ministers of religion, with the holiness and other duties of their ministry.

I recommended patience, which softens the afflictions of sufferers, to the distressed, after informing them that the legislative powers alone were competent to redress a general grievance, and that a disorderly conduct was a bad recommendation to their humanity.

Here are the comments of the Lord Bishop of Cloyne upon the above texts, 'To what do these lectures of Mr. O'Leary 'tend? To tell the insurgents that though he knows that 'they are more oppressed than any sect of men in the world: 'though he is convinced that they had a right to expect re-'dress from the humanity of the legislature; yet the legis-'lature shew no compassion for them; they must remain in 'their misery: they *have no remedy but that of patience*, '*which softens the afflictions of sufferers.*'

I am not ashamed of the admonitions—But I blush at the censure: I prefer the charitable Samaritan, who did not offer up sacrifices in Solomon's Temple, yet relieved the bleeding man on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho; I prefer him to the unfeeling Priest and Levite, who passed by unconcerned, without pitying a man whom they saw weltering in his blood. I shall ever pity the poor, and shall ever

recommend them to their rulers. If this be a crime, may it be the only crime of which I may be found guilty.

I recommend them to their rulers; it would have been more becoming in the Lord Bishop of Cloyne to have done the same, than to censure me for the feelings of piety. I still indulge the hope, that the legislators of Ireland will redress the grievances of the wretched, at the period which their wisdom will appoint. And I am very confident that they will glory in feelings congenial to those of Francis the First, who, on hearing that a nobleman had killed a peasant, dressed himself in mourning, bound up his arm in a scarf, sent for the murderer, to whom he said, Rebel, you have wounded your king in the right arm, in depriving him of one of the props of the state. For without the peasantry, who will feed my armies, or supply my treasury?

The plough, the spade and reaping-hook, handled by vigorous, healthy, and well-fed peasants, are of more benefit to the state, than a thousand goose-quills, brandished by so many controvertists, puzzling the minds and dividing the hearts of men and citizens, who in the interests of society, and the feelings of humanity, would soon extinguish the flames of discord, if the sacred fire were not continually fed by the very hands that should preserve the temple of peace from the conflagration. It is the peasant's labour, and not his catechism, that should be the object of legislative attention, says Voltaire.

The Lord Bishop of Cloyne censures me for pointing out to the insurgents the dangers that threatened them from the severity of the law, the eloquence of Crown-lawyers, the perjuries of witnesses, and the prejudices of juries. What was the purport of this enumeration, but to make a deeper impression on the minds of the deluded people, by a greater variety of images? And thus to attain my end, by preventing them from disturbing the peace of the public, and rushing to their own destruction.

The Lord Bishop of Cloyne's remark on the above passage is curious, and descriptive of his ingenuity and candour. I shall give it in his own words, 'After expatiating on the 'severity of the laws, as not being *fit for a christian coun-* '*try* and warning them that they could not expect a fair

'execution, even of those cruel ordinances, from the law-'officers of the crown, the witnesses or jury, I think one 'may say with justice, of his address *to the common people* '*of Ireland, particularly to such of them as are called* '*Whiteboys*, (printed in Dublin, 1786, and revised and cor-'rected by himself,) that it is calculated to raise discontent 'and indignation in the Roman Catholic peasantry, against 'the national clergy, the legislature, the executive power, 'and their Protestant fellow-subjects.'

Let the reader compare my letters with the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's commentary. Had I said in plain terms to the insurgents, 'Do not put yourselves in the power either of 'Judge or Jury, King or Parliament, Lawyer or Witness, 'what would it amount to?' No more than if I had said, behave as peaceable subjects, and do not put yourselves in the power of any person. I say it now; I give the same advice, and will the Lord Bishop of Cloyne say that for giving this advice, I am seditious? It well behoves the Lord Bishop of Cloyne, who calls the verdict of the Jury in the county of Monaghan, infamous; and who becomes the eulogist of Theophilus, who has the effrontery to compare the Irish House of Commons to plunderers, for passing a vote against the tithes of agistment; to carp at my words about witnesses and juries.

His Lordship's letter verifies the words of Saint Paul, *Wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself.*

In order to expose me to the detestation of the clergy of the established religion, he attributes the following words to me: *These disturbances originate in the dues of the clergy.**

I never wrote, nor made use of such words: I am sorry that the Lord Bishop of Cloyne has put it in my power to anwer the charge with a flat contradiction: the Lord Bishop of Cloyne dates his pamphlet in 1787, and remarks that I think it expedient to inform the Whiteboys, that the Whiteboy act will be in force till next June. The remark is shrewd, and of a very charitable tendency,

My first address to the Whiteboys was in March eighty-

* Lord Bishop of Cloyne's Pamphlet, page 106, third Edition.

six—a rumour was propagated amongst the insurgents, that the Whiteboy act would be no longer in force after the ensuing June. To guard a deluded multitude against every danger to which they might be exposed, from an expectation of impunity in consequence of their ignorance of the law, I informed them that the Whiteboy act would be in force until the month of June eighty-seven: this was a long warning of fifteen months. What means then the Lord Bishop of Cloyne by his remark? It impresses the minds of his readers with the notion that this is Mr. O'Leary's meaning, viz. 'the Whiteboy act will be at an end next 'June; after that time you have nothing to dread, you may 'go on.' His Lordship means this, or means nothing.

What an opinion must not strangers to my principles and conduct, form of me when they read the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's pamphlet!

About twenty years ago, when the Whiteboys first rose up in the South, a person of consequence (who is since dead) contributed to the insurrection, in order to defeat a plan that was then intended by Parliament for the relief of the Catholics, whom by this diabolical stratagem, worthy of another Cecil, he intended to render obnoxious to their rulers. I intended to reclaim the Whiteboys by every argument which prudence, as well as religion could suggest: and as the report of the expiration of the Whiteboy act in the month of the ensuing June, was propagated amongst the people, I know not by whom, (but I knew that the motive was such) I thought it incumbent on me to guard the deluded multitude against the snare, and to shelter the honour of the Catholic body, by defeating the designs, and disappointing the hopes of such artful politicians. I would be an enemy to the peace of society, the Catholic body, and to myself, if I had written in the sense which the Lord Bishop of Cloyne would fain convey to his readers. Far from encouraging the insurgents to proclaim a *truce of three months to concert* their plan in the interim, and renew the war with fresh vigour, at the expiration of the term, (for such must be the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's meaning,) I applied for information to a Protestant gentleman, who is married to the daughter of a clergyman in the diocese of

Cloyne, and who wrote to the Whiteboys under the signature *of a Dublin Shopkeeper*. If I intended to encourage them in their proceedings, by marking out the time beyond which they had nothing to dread, I would have abridged the term, and pleaded ignorance of the laws.

To examine further into the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's commentaries on my texts, would be not only a loss of time, *but childish*. Or what must the public think of the ingenuity of a Prelate, who construes the *way of the cross is the road to the crown, into* sedition.

I am surprised that his Lordship has not adverted to those words of my last address to the Whiteboys, "Multitudes are easily misled, and incapable of drawing the delicate line, to which common sense points out, and of which it says, thus far you shall go, and no farther."

I am surprised that he has not made the following comments on them, 'You have done very well in disturbing 'the peace of society, cropping cattle and burning corn; 'but stop now, and wait for a while.' This would have opened a field for criticism, though he should know that the giddy populace, let their complaints be ever so well founded, is easily misled; when once in motion never knows where to stop, and can never draw the delicate line which common sense points out, and of which it says, *thus far you shall go; if you have complaints lay them before your rulers; but go no further*. And no further shall I go in explaining letters which may be read in the Appendix. His query then to me about the Emperor of Germany is not in point. But I shall take the liberty of proposing a query very applicable to the present circumstances.

Quere. What would the Emperor of Germany, who has granted free toleration of all religions with a conjunction to their teachers, not to divide his subjects, or distract his dominions with the jarings of controversy, but to enforce the principles of morality. What would that tolerating prince think of a Catholic Prelate, who in a pamphlet, would ring the alarm all over his dominions, and inform his Majesty, that none but his subjects of the established religion were entitled to national confidence, and thus inspire his subjects, not with mutual confidence, but with mutual jealousy,

fear, and distrust? I leave the Lord Bishop of Cloyne to judge.

When the Lord Bishop of Cloyne begins his query, with these words, 'if there were an insurrection of Protestants 'in Bohemia, for the purpose of robbing the established Ro-'man Catholic clergy, and there might have been Protes-'tants enough if the perfidious Cruelty of the late Empress 'had not nearly rooted them out.'*

When his Lordship begins his query with such words, I must take the liberty of reminding him, that in his short query there are two fallacies. The first fallacy is in these words, *if there were an insurrection of Protestants in Bohemia.* For the insurgents in the South of Ireland, were merely Catholics, as I have proved in my narrative: they were a motley group of different religions, complaining both of tithes and tithe-jobbers. Our readers will be surprised that in the course of our controversy, we have been so sparing of latin words; this fallacy then is called by the logicians *a dicto simpliciter ad dictum secundum quid;* when we confine to a few what is common to many, and vice versa. The second fallacy consists in supposing that my writings have a tendency to rob the Protestant Clergy; and this fallacy is called by the logicians *de falso supponente*—a false supposition, which the respondent answers with a flat denial, by saying *nego suppositum.*

When the Lord Bishop of Cloyne calls the late Empress Queen, *cruel and perfidious*, I wish he were a little more courtly and flattering in his epithets; rudeness to the fair sex, from an ascetick or hermit like me, who by the obligations of celibacy had not an opportunity of polishing and refining my manners by a more frequent and friendly intercourse with the softest and fairest part of the creation; rudeness in me would have some excuse to plead, but in his attack on the illustrious fair, little or no excuse can be pleaded for the Lord Bishop, who from his early days was at liberty to court and pray; to repeat the Penitential Psalms with David, and to compliment with Otway:

> O Woman, lovely woman! nature form'd thee
> To temper man; we had been brutes without thee.

* See the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's Pamphlet, page 111; fifth Edition.

Little or no excuse then can be pleaded in favour of the Lord Bishop of Cloyne, when he treats the late Empress Queen with such severity:* for she was neither *cruel nor perfidious*. His Lordship was not a member of her Privy Council, to know the nature of her compacts with, or promises to her subjects; compacts and promises in the performance of which no Sovereign could be more honourable and punctual. She had in her dominions the descendants of those German boors who had attempted to dethrone her ancestors. Those men were under legal restraints for their fathers' guilt, in which they had no part. It was their unhappy fate, in common with many others, to be victims to human laws, which by a faint resemblance of Omnipotence, make of the folly, or madness, or weakness of one generation, a kind of original and hereditary sin, which afflicts in a long succession the innocent posterity, with this difference, that the offence against the Deity is instantly forgiven upon repentance, or the application of the remedy which mercy appoints to counteract the rigour of justice. But human legislators all over Europe, have given proofs of their omnipotence in penal codes which immortalize the punishment ages after the death of the guilt, and require a rigorous atonement from the sober and innocent decendants, for the frenzy of their forefathers. They have their patent in Scripture, wherein we read, *I have said, ye are Gods and all Sons of the Most High.* But Dryden's Indian Emperor was tortured for paying a greater veneration to the bright luminary of the day, than to a book bound up in sheep skin, which Pizzaro's chaplain called the Bible, and of which the unhappy prince knew nothing. To each of those legislators who punished their subjects for hereditary errors, or their forefathers' guilt, Dryden's Indian Emperor would say,

> If thou art that most cruel God, whose eyes
> Delight in blood, and human sacrifice.

Such was the state of the Hussites in the Empress Queen's dominions, and such was the case of Catholics and Dissenters under Protestant Sovereigns, when prelates of the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's philanthropy directed their councils; as the Reverend Mr. Samuel Barber of Rathfryland, has ingeni-

* Rudeness would be an improper word when I am animadverting on the writings of a Bishop.

ously and pointedly remarked to the Lord Bishop of Cloyne.*

The state of the Hussites in Bohemia was not worse than the state of the Dissenters and Catholics in Ireland, even so late as the beginning of that illustrious Empress's reign.

That magnanimous Heroine, surrounded by numerous and powerful foes, ready to invade her dominions, and to ornament the triumphal car with the procession of a captive Queen, worked up the softer soul to a martial firmness. Reduced to fifteen thousand men, against the numerous armies of powerful Sovereigns, she took in her arms the present Emperor, who was then in his cradle, shewed him to her subjects of every religious description, 'behold your prince unable to protect you; defend his rights, 'and when those infant hands will be able to wield the 'Sceptre, the grateful remembrance of your services will 'procure you the love, favour, and protection of your 'Sovereign.'

It was the characteristic of the rude courtiers and stern divines of Queen Elizabeth's reign, not to pity a Queen in distress; but at the sight of Maria Teresa controuling fortune on the verge of ruin, a generous ardour glowed in every breast. Her Protestant subjects of Hungary flocked to her banners, and as the reward of their loyalty, she repealed the restrictive laws which former Sovereigns had enacted. As a proof of her fidelity to her promise, she ordered her son's picture to be hung up in their houses of worship, making it high treason to molest them in the exercise of their religion. What the mother began in her hereditary kingdom, the son completed all over his dominions.

This is the historical information which the Lord Bishop of Cloyne should have given his readers. But it would not answer his ends: cruelty, perfidy, and persecution are his favourite theme; generosity, humanity, and toleration are quite shadowed in his picture. Catholic powers are embracing their subjects, without inquiring into their catechism: if an enemy of toleration were as industrious in

* See Remarks on a Pamphlet, entitled "The Present State of the Church of Ireland," by Samuel Barber.

translating into French or German, the Bishop of Cloyne's pamphlet, as he has been in translating Ghilini's letter, and the Bishop's consecration oath into English; violation of faith with heretics, and other charges: if in consequence of the impression his pamphlet had made on the public minds, Catholic princes, prelates, and doctors, read the clause proposing to empower the civil magistrates to pull down, level, and prostrate Roman Catholic chapels upon the deposition of one witness; if they read all the pamphlets published of late against the Catholic body, and knew the steps that are taking in order to degrade them; I appeal to his Lordship, and to the public, whether the Bishop of Cloyne's pamphlet, and the proceedings now mentioned, would tend to promote toleration?

What was the Bishop of Cloyne's intention in abusing the memory of the Empress Queen? Why has not he proposed her good qualities, and the tolerating spirit of her son as models for imitation? Or does he really believe the case of a Bohemian Hussite, now restored to the privilege of the great and inalienable charter, to which a man guilty of no personal crime against the state is entitled? Does he really believe his case, and that of an Irish Catholic to be quite similar? If the Irish Catholics profess the religion of the greatest monarchs, and the creed of flourishing Universities, one would imagine that their faith should not make them objects of contempt. They introduced no new religion into the state, nor encroached upon any man's property. They had the lands of their fathers, and the religion of their education, ages before their Sovereigns thought fit to change their creeds. Their blood flows in the veins of the Protestant nobility and gentry of Ireland, whose pedigree is proclaimed the more illustrious, in proportion as they trace it back to Catholic times. Their loyalty at home, and their valour abroad, when disqualifying laws, and the thirst of glory urged them to dispute the laurel under the banners of foreign kings, cannot disgrace the kindred of affinity the Catholic noblemen and gentlemen may claim to the Protestant nobility and gentry of the land. Had the island been even subdued by the sword of the conqueror, conquest itself has its limits circumscribed by justice. Transfer of allegiance, and the tribute paid to the former Sovereign, is all that the

conqueror is entitled to. Locke would grant him no more, but would secure in the unchangeable profession of their consciences and inheritance, the subjects who had changed their masters. They had the prescription of ages to plead for their religion and properties, when the wrecks of both were secured to them by the laws of nations under the walls of Limerick. This capitulation, which it was in their power to break forty-eight hours after the interchange of the articles, they adhered to inviolably. It was shamefully broken by the daughter of the very king to whom they had sworn allegiance, though from the day on which it was signed until this very hour, not a pistol was fired, or a sword drawn by a Catholic in this kingdom against the state. Such being the case, which no man can contradict, what must not be the indignation of every man of feeling, when he sees about two millions of Irish subjects treated with as little ceremony as if they were a set of negro slaves upon a West India plantation; compared to a pack of hounds impatient at the view of the game; and to a set of treacherous, insidious, and faithless Popish rebels, to be cut off by his Majesty's sword.* Could mortals foresee that, in the year eighty-seven, a clause would be introduced into the Irish House of Commons, for the purpose of pulling down, levelling and prostrating Roman Catholic chapels, if one witness swore before two magistrates that an unlawful oath was taken in said chapel, or in any place adjoining thereto! It would be more honourable to banish the whole Catholic body out of the kingdom, after giving them sufficient time and notice for selling their properties, than to offer them the insult of proposing on the evidence of a single witness the destruction of their houses of worship, in the course of the same session when a member of Parliament talked of *heads of a bill to prevent the stealing of dogs.*

We read of two philosophers in antiquity, the one continually laughing, and the other continually crying at the scenes of human life. This contrast would unite them both. Christian houses of worship to be demolished, and the *kennels of dogs* to be protected by the law.

* See Theophilus, called by the Bishop of Cloyne an able writer against whom it is hard to prove a negative, and (Proh Deum et hominum fides!) by Counsellor Dominick Trant, a well meaning writer.

After what I have related in the course of my narrative, and in the vindication of my writings, I cannot see how the Irish Catholics deserved such severe and disgraceful usage, as to have their houses of worship treated with the same indignity as if they were houses of prostitution, or cabinets of leagues and confederacies against the crown and dignity of our most gracious Sovereign. If they were either the one or the other, they would not be destroyed upon the evidence of one witness, at a time when twenty witnesses would take a hundred false oaths for the twentieth part of the materials (which were proposed as a reward) for the demolishers of chapels: much less would a temple of Venus be demolished, because a thousand unlawful oaths would be taken in places adjoining it. The only fault with which the Catholic body can be upbraided, is their misfortune originating from their attachment to their religion, without any disloyalty to their Kings; but unfortunate people ought not to be insulted. The most flourishing empires, as well as individuals, are not proof against the revolutions of time, and the vicissitudes of fortune.

Marius, the great conqueror of the Cimbri, was seen in a reclining posture, and forlorn and half famished on the ruins of Carthage, formerly the rival of Rome. The sight of such a change disarmed the officer who was sent to behead him, when the other cried out, *go and tell the governor that you have seen Marius hungry on the ruins of Carthage.* Travellers pay a certain respect to the ruins of old temples and other buildings stripped of their former decorations; and it would be matter of surprise, if in the very blaze of toleration, the legislature of Ireland would pay such little regard to the descendants of the people, who in former times opened their houses and seminaries for the reception of all the natives of Europe, who flocked to them for improvement, and erected magnificent structures in honour of the Deity, as to force them to pray in the open air. The dissolution of morals amongst the lower orders, deprived of a place of worship, and the scandal of Europe would be the consequence of such a rigorous law. The Irish senate foresaw it, and to their honour rejected the clause.

The Catholics of Ireland should be very thankful to the

Lord Bishop of Cloyne for endeavouring to procure them the confidence of their rulers. And the Dissenters and Catholics of Ireland are no less thankful to you, Counsellor Trant, for your kind assistance in becoming his auxiliary, and painting both as *internal confederated enemies against the constitution.** You, doubtless, glory in a revolution which has spread the broad basis of your civil and religious liberty; you should not have forgotten the heroes of Enniskillen, nor the defenders of Derry, against the forces of James the Second, to whom the latter had sworn allegiance, and whose son-in-law the former had placed on the throne. For a gentleman who is so well versed in history as you are, should know that the combined efforts of the Dissenters and Catholics could have turned the scale at that critical period, and put a speedy end to the contests. Both parties were well rewarded for their exertions in support of the cause which to each seemed best: the daughter riveted the chains of the Dissenters, who had procured her the throne, by the exaltation of her brother-in-law, and gave the *coup de grace* to the Catholics, for having fought in her father's cause, before they could have any notion that she would sway the sceptre which dropped from his feeble and unnerved hands. Since that memorable æra, so undeservedly degrading to both, the Dissenters and Catholics of Ireland have behaved with equal loyalty to each succeeding monarch.

The Lord Bishop of Cloyne and you have paid them a very handsome compliment—the Bishop excludes them from national confidence, on account of their readiness to pull down and set up: and you proclaim them internal confederated enemies against the constitution.

The Reverend Mr. Barber has shaved the Lord Bishop of Cloyne with a keen and polished razor; and he is very capable of trimming your pamphlet. May I ask you a few questions? Can you assign a reason for calling Theophilus a *well-meaning writer?* Is it for calling your flesh and blood a pack of hounds? You are the son of respectable Roman Catholic parents: you need not blush at it, for the reasons already alleged. Is it in your father's loyal and hospitable

* See Counsellor Trant's Pamphlet.

family, you have discovered any plot against the state? Is it amongst the respectable Dissenters and Catholics of the county of Cork? You have travelled over the most refined nations in Europe, and conversed with the Roman nobility, not far from the tombs of Scipio and Emilius. In Catholic countries have you discovered any treacherous correspondence between the Catholics of Ireland and the Princes of the houses of Bourbon and Sardinia, whom your *well-meaning Theophilus* points out as their deliverers? You go over the same ground with the Lord Bishop of Cloyne, and talk of *Papists disarming Protestants.* Did not this happen in the night time? Are you so clear-sighted as to discover a man's religion in the dark, when you are slumbering on your pillow? I doubt not but that some Protestants gave up their arms with as much reluctance as Counsellor Trant would reach forth his hand to receive the Commission of a Judge, when the Quarter Sessions are to be established in Munster, or the patent of a Vicar General. For numbers of them would not be much concerned if proctors, tithe-canters, and tithes, were at a great distance beyond Purgatory; which contributed so much to the establishment of those church revenues, which give the Lord Bishop of Cloyne and the Counsellor an occasion of rough-handling the Catholics and Dissenters of Ireland. The Lord Bishop of Cloyne preaches against what he deems the superstition; but likes to live well by the institution to which it gave rise.

In the same strain with the Lord Bishop of Cloyne, you speak of notices threatening to burn a new church, and to change an old church into a mass-house.

Is Counsellor Trant in earnest? Does he really believe that a Catholic ever posted up that notice? Is the new church burnt? Is the old church sprinkled with holy water? If he gave himself the trouble to read my addresses to the Whiteboys, with the same attention with which Doctor Woodward read them, in order to brand me with sedition; he must know the manner in which I ridiculed the idea. Where would they have found a chaplain to give them mass in that church? Or does Counsellor Trant believe that night strollers who would not hear mass from their own pastors, would die martyrs for prayers near the Bishop of

Cloyne's communion table? *Apage Nugæ!* This I remarked before, and I here repeat it. But will Mr. O'Leary deny that such a notice was posted up? By no means. He has read the memoirs of artful knaves, and knows that there are still living, and will be found to the end of time ingenious Hoyles, who can lay down rules for playing *a game of political whist.* A Cardinal, whose life was a disgrace to the purple, got information that Pope Innocent the Eleventh, intended to expel him the Sacred College in consequence of complaints daily preferred against him to his eminence; the crafty courtier wrote to the Pope an anonymous letter against himself, informing his Holiness that the Cardinal was so profligate, that a Roman lady was to be found with him the following night, in such an apartment of his palace, and requesting his Holiness to procure personal information; the Pope, who was a man of the most rigid morals, came with his guards in the dead of night to the Cardinal's palace, and forced his way into the apartment, where to his surprise, he found the holy man with his arms expanded before a crucifix, and on his bare knees upon a flag instead of carpet. The stratagem succeeded, and from that night forward he never would listen to any complaints against the Cardinal. Rather the Lord Bishop of Cloyne and Counsellor Trant, must produce the person who posted up the notice threatening to burn a new church, or leave me at liberty to attribute the notice to a much similar stratagem. They should have inquired whether tithe-jobbers did not contrive to set fire to their own corn, in order to prevent any alteration in the system of tithes, and to draw the vengeance of the laws upon deluded peasants, who were already but too obnoxious. Many evidences should be produced to support Counsellor Trant's charge; and if he produced ten thousand, not one of them, but upon examination, would be discovered a false witness.

That Doctor Woodward, the Lord Bishop of Cloyne, come from Westminster School to enjoy an Irish Bishopric, should insult the natives of Ireland, both Dissenters and Catholics, by excluding them from confidence, I am not surprised. Every allowance must be made for the prejudices

of early education. Perhaps at the age of twenty, he imagined that the Irish *walked upon all fours*, as an English Judge at the age of forty, a few years ago, wrote to his agent, to know whether there was a slated house in Dublin, to hire for his accommodation on his arrival. His Lordship is further by his profession and consecration hostile to all doctrines except his own, and interested in tithes, which in Ireland bring him in a greater income than he could expect in England. But that Counsellor Trant, a native of the land, a man of the world, whose mind should be enlarged by a more extensive intercourse with people of every description, and a gentleman of independent fortune, should stand forth as a pamphlet writer, in support of the charges of the well-meaning, scurrilous and slanderous Theophilus, must be to his acquaintances a matter of surprise. There is not, however, a fortune-teller in the county of Cork, but could guess at the reason; and the reason must be very pressing, when Counsellor Trant commits himself with almost the bulk of the natives of Ireland, by calling them *internal confederated enemies against the constitution* of this kingdom.

It is to be expected that in the second edition, and all future editions of his pamphlet, he will mark down in large legible characters the above assertion amongst the *errata*; otherwise he must sanctify himself among *the beneficed clergy*, for no Dissenting or Catholic gentleman can with any warmth of affection keep company with their accuser.

The senate of the nation is now assembled. The Lord Bishop of Cloyne and Counsellor Trant are in Dublin; and I am here to meet them. I call on them both in the face of the kingdom, to bring forth their charges against the Catholic body. I call on them to contradict what I have related. I call on them to prove *Popish confederacy* against church or state. I cite them before the senate of the nation. —They are silent, they decline the summons. Let the reader infer the consequence.

SECTION THE THIRD;

Containing a Refutation of the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's Arguments, drawn from the Legate's Letter and the Catholic Bishop's Consecration Oath.

In the persecutions against the primitive Christians, their enemies used to dress them in the skins of sheep and other animals, and after having forced on their bodies their livery of contempt, used to cry out *Christiani ad bestias; to the wild beasts with the Christians.* The enemies of the Catholics of this kingdom have been so industrious of late, in dressing them in a strange drapery, and attributing to *them sedition, hostility to the state, and doctrines inconsistent with the security of the throne*, as to excite a general clamour *Catholici ad funem; to the halter with the Catholics.* To refute every charge would make up a volume. My defence is already swelled to a tolerable size; and after a full vindication of the Catholic body, and of my own conduct, I think it needless to take up my reader's time with any farther tedious discussions.

However, as the Lord Bishop of Cloyne has favoured the public with a translation of Ghilini's letter, and the Catholic Bishop's consecration oath, I must trespass further on the patience of my readers. The Catholic body must be grossly misrepresented if the public are to believe that the opinions of Casuists make a part of their creed. Were I to sum up all the erroneous opinions of the Divines who professed themselves members of the church of England, and the opinions of several other Protestant Divines; did I collect them all into a volume with this title, *the Creed of the Right Reverend Doctor Woodward, the Lord Bishop of Cloyne*, how would he gaze with astonishment, and exclaim against my want of sincerity and candour! In the very supposition then, that Burke and Ghilini were really of the opinion which the Lord Bishop of Cloyne attributes to

them, how far does it affect the Catholics of Ireland, or the Catholics all over the world? When the Elector of Saxony proposed a case of conscience to Luther and Melancthon to know whether in the absence of his wife or during her pregnancy he would make use of another? Those Casuists answered in the affirmative. A case of conscience much similar was proposed to Bishop Burnet. After labouring much, and torturing texts of Scripture, the humane Divine decided that polygamy was lawful. Would it not be ridiculous in me to force into the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's conscience, such decisions as articles of creed? Nay, some Protestant Divines went further. Doctor Dopping, Bishop of Meath, preached publicly in Christ church, Dublin, that violation of faith with Catholics was lawful, in justification of the breach of the articles of Limerick. To several Christian Divines then can be applied, what Cicero said of the philosophers of his time, *that there was no absurdity so glaring, but had some philosopher to support it.* If then the Lord Bishop of Cloyne intends to swell the Catholic creed, with the opinions of Catholic Schoolmen, I shall repay him tenfold, by sending to him a collection of absurdities and strange doctrines advanced by Protestant authors. Every man of sense will acknowledge this a sufficient answer to his Lordship's remark on Ghilini's letter. And what is Ghilini's opinion to countervail the doctrine sworn to by the Prelates and Catholics of Ireland, both clergy and laity? Or does the Lord Bishop of Cloyne intend to hold us up to our King and Country, as unprincipled perjurers? This is severe usage to men, labouring under so many disqualifications, because they refuse to take an oath against the conviction of their consciences. Let the most profligate amongst us swear against our whole creed, he is believed, and becomes an adoptive child of the state. When we swear against imputed doctrines without fee or reward, it is hard indeed if we deserve no credit. But without being an apologist for Ghilini, much less for Burke, has the Lord Bishop of Cloyne fairly stated the case, and the principles on which the titular Archbishop of Rhodes rejected the oath, which in reality he did not, nor could understand as well as the Catholics of Ireland? Did he say, or could he

have the absurd effrontery to say that Catholics could not in conscience swear allegiance to a Protestant King, when in the purest ages of the Christian Religion, the primitive Christians swore allegiance to the Heathen Cæsars? When the rigid Tertullian, a stranger to fear or flattery, who would expire in the tortures of the rack for his belief, has left us an abridgment of the prayer offered up by Christian subjects for their Pagan rulers. 'We pray, says this great 'man, We pray for the Emperors, and that God may grant 'them a long life and a quiet reign: that their family may 'be safe, and their forces valiant: their senate wise, their 'people orderly and virtuous: that they may rule in peace, 'and enjoy all the blessings they can desire either as 'men or princes. *Et omnia quæ tendunt ad Cæsar's 'votum.*'*

Upon what ground does Ghilini reject the oath? from ignorance. It is evident from his letter that he did not know the nature of it. His very words prove it to demonstration. I shall give them in the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's own translation.

Extract from Ghilini's letter.

'Besides, whether he be inviolably bound as the new form 'prescribes, to be always true and faithful to his Majesty, 'which is afterwards explained to affirm upon oath *according 'to the sense intended by the laws of Ireland*, is to me a very '*dubious point.*' [Remark here, Irish reader, how Ghilini doubts.] 'For since the laws of England and Ireland re-'cognise the King as head of the Church, and the foun-'tain of its spiritual authority, he who takes such an oath 'and promises to be faithful to his Majesty, according to 'the prescription of the laws of Ireland, might also recog-'nize the King as head of the Church, and the fountain of 'its spiritual authority. Should it happen that such expres-'sions either were or could be so understood, your most 'illustrious Lordships and each of the Catholics themselves, 'ought to take notice that this is a most manifest error, 'and directly contrary to the principles of the Catholic

* Tertullian's Apology.

'religion, which acknowledges only one head and fountain 'of all spiritual authority, namely, the Roman Pontiff.'

From these very words the reader may know that the Nuncio did not know the nature of the oath. He confounds civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and imagines that the Irish legislature proposed an oath of allegiance to the Catholics, binding them to acknowledge the King as Pope, head of the universal Church, and the fountain of all spiritual authority; whereas they only swore that no foreign Prince, Prelate, or Potentate, hath or ought to have any civil jurisdiction within these realms. Hence the doubts and ignorance of an Italian casuist, are trumpeted over three kingdoms, as articles of Catholic belief, and waved as so many signals for persecution.

Nor does the Lord Bishop of Cloyne discriminate the clauses of the oath from each other; nor explain the distinctions of which Ghilini's letter is susceptible, with that accuracy to which he should have attended if he expected an answer.

In the same period of the oath, there are two clauses, the one 'disclaiming violation of faith with heretics, as an arti-'cle of Catholic belief:' the other 'disclaiming the depo-'sition of Kings, in consequence of Papal excommunications.' The Legate gives his opinion, that the condemnation of the latter as abominable is absolutely intolerable, because, according to him, this doctrine *(Hanc Doctrinam)* has been defended and contended for by most Catholic nations, and the Holy See has frequently followed it in practice.

It is to be remarked, that he speaks in the singular number, *(doctrinam hanc,)* and alludes to the indirect deposing power, supported by some ultramontane Canonists, whom the Legate in consequence of his prejudices in favour of the court of Rome, enlarges into most Catholic nations. For violation of faith with heretics was never defended nor contended for by Catholic nations, much less by the Apostolic See. But it has been detested and exclaimed against, as a black slander, invented by indelicate controvertists, in order to misrepresent the Catholic doctrine, and to bring an odium on the Apostolic See. This the Lord Bishop of Cloyne should know.

If he had no authority but that of Doctor Hayes, who proved it a slander five or six years ago in Scotland; or of Mr. O'Leary, who exclaimed against it as a slander about the same time in Ireland, and who proclaims it a slander still; the Lord Bishop of Cloyne might plead the pliant policy of men, who, under the terror of prosecution, were obliged to soften their doctrine. But when he reads Natalis Alexander, a Dominican friar, in his dissertations on Ecclesiastical History; Arnaldus, in his apology, and so many Catholic divines writing in Catholic countries, against violation of faith with heretics, and making it out downright slander; the Lord Bishop of Cloyne might have spared himself the trouble of translating Ghilini's letter: that Legate then must allude to the indirect deposing power exploded all over the world, though supported by some Italian Canonists, and unsuccessfully attempted by some Popes, not in consequence of any divine right, but in consequence of a temporal claim, founded either on compacts or a long prescription pleaded against monarchs, whose predecessors had rendered their kingdoms tributary to the Holy See.

If the Protestant Bishop of Cloyne, who is so ardent for the security of his tithes, (the occasion of so many disturbances in this kingdom,) had the same title to Peter's-pence, and been as powerful as the Roman Pontiffs were at the beginning of the reformation, he would have been as clamorous as Pope Paul the Fourth, and Sixtus Quintus, who considered England as *a fief* of the Holy See.* For the generality of church-men, however divided as to creeds, agree very well in one point, viz. *not to part with what they have.* Hence they are called *Mortmain* in law form, perhaps from the *gripe of a dead man's hand.* The best manner of living on good terms with them, is to give them all, and take nothing from them: but such is not the present humour of Catholic Monarchs, who, without any breach of the Catholic doctrine, and in defiance of the thunders of the Vatican, lay siege to the Pope's cities, if he gives them any provocation. In vain would he fulminate his excommunications on the score of

* This was the answer of Pope Paul the Fourth, to Queen Elizabeth's Ambassadors.

temporalities. They are considered as a *fulmen brutem.* The Lord Bishop of Cloyne then either misunderstands Ghilini's letter, or tortures it as he tortured Mr. O'Leary's writings. I would stake my life this very instant, that if the Lord Bishop of Cloyne wrote to the Nuncio, and asked him if he meant in his letter that violation of faith with heretics, was a doctrine defended, contended for by most Catholic nations, and frequently followed in practice by the Holy See; I would stake my life that the Nuncio would write to the Lord Bishop of Cloyne a very obliging letter, in which he would disclaim any such meaning, equally with the doctrine. The Nuncio mentions in his letter, *doctrinam*, doctrine. The Lord Bishop of Cloyne changes doctrine into doctrines, the plural number, in the following manner, page twenty-two of his pamphlet.

'The Legate treats the clauses in the proposed oath, 'containing a declaration of abhorrence and detestation of 'the *doctrines*, that faith is not to be kept with heretics; and 'that princes deprived by the Pope may be deposed, as ab-'solutely intolerable, because those *doctrines* are defended 'and contended for by most Catholic nations.' Had the Legate expressed himself in the same identical words with the Lord Bishop of Cloyne, there would be no need of any comment. We would condemn the Legate's ignorance, and the horror of his doctrine in a more pointed manner. But here it is a Roman courtier, who is so zealous for the honour of his ultramontane Canonists, who supported the discarded deposing power, and takes offence that their *doctrine* should be called abominable; and for this reason says, that such a stricture is intolerable. The Lord Bishop of Cloyne, from brotherly love, increases the ecclesiastical funds, by adding to the Archbishop of Rhodes's doctrine of the indirect deposing power, *violation of faith with heretics*, of which the other certainly could not think. Thus one Prelate shews an extraordinary generosity in bestowing on his Confrere more than he would *accept of.* Nothing more then can be inferred from this letter, than that the Titular Archbishop of Rhodes doubts the validity of an oath, of the nature of which he expresses his ignorance, in imagining that the Catholics of Ireland intended to make a Pope

of their Sovereign. In his very ignorance he nevertheless shews the abhorrence in which he holds a false oath. Whereas in the alternative of perjury or suffering, he recommends to the Catholics to suffer for ever under the penal laws, sooner than to take an oath which he deems erroneous. The same can be said of Burke, who calls it *horrible impiety*, to say that a Catholic who had sworn allegiance to George the Third, should abjure the same King if he became a Catholic. Under the change of religion, he considers the oath taken to a Protestant King still binding, when he alters his creed. Of what advantage then Ghilini's letter can be to the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's cause, after the bustle it has occasioned, let the reader determine. This case of conscience proposed to an Italian, by a doating Prelate who filled up a volume with minutiæ and trifling occurrences, concerns the Catholics of Ireland as much as the question which Rabelais proposed to the logicians; *whether a chimæra bouncing in a vacuum, could eat up the premises of a syllogism? Numquid chimæra in vacuo, bombinans possit comedere, primas intentiones?*

The Lord Bishop of Cloyne cries out with an air of triumph, 'who is the voucher to be set in opposition to the 'Legate of the Pope?' And I raise my voice in my turn. 'Who is the Pope's Legate? A man who did not know the 'nature of the subject of his letter, to be set in opposition to 'the Catholic clergy of Ireland? Or who is the Pope him-'self, to be set in opposition to all ages acknowledging the 'right that Temporal Princes have to the allegiance of their 'subjects; whether those Princes were Trojans or Constan-'tines? Or who is the Lord Bishop of Cloyne, to be 'fabricating creeds for his neighbours?' Are not Catholic Prelates better and more competent vouchers of the Catholic doctrine, than a person reared out of their communion? He may alarm the ignorant with a letter which the Catholic Prelates condemned in the year 1775. If he attacks the Catholics on a fair ground, why does not he explain their genuine principles? Or does he intend to sport with common sense, in erecting the decision of every doating Casuist, into an article of Catholic belief? If he does, I shall

meet him on his own ground and swell his creed to an enormous bulk, by adding to it the reveries and extravagant opinions of those writers who attacked the church of Rome, and at the same time struck into those devious paths, in which the Lord Bishop of Cloyne must acknowledge that scripture was not their guide; or if he acknowledges it, he must renounce his creed.

The Lord Bishop of Cloyne has favoured the public with the Catholic Bishops' consecration oath: and from what motive? To insinuate to the public, that the oath of allegiance they have taken to their Sovereign is not to be relied on, and consequently that they and their flocks are not to be trusted. I should imagine that common justice should have induced him, not to throw out such an injurious intimation, and that the Catholic Prelates are the most competent judges of the sense and meaning of an oath which they take at their consecration.

The Lord Bishop of Cloyne has translated the entire oath at the close, and given the most obnoxious clauses of it in the twenty-third page of his pamphlet. Let us now examine the most obnoxious clauses of this oath. *For as to visiting the thresholds of the Apostles every three years;* I believe the Lord Bishop of Cloyne would not quarrel with his fellow Prelates whom his pamphlet is calculated to transport out of the kingdom.

I. 'They promise to be faithful and obedient to Saint 'Peter the Apostle, and to the Holy Roman Church, and 'to their Lord the Pope, and his successors canonically 'entering.'

II. 'The Roman Papacy and the royalties of Saint Peter, 'to assist the Pope and his successors, to retain and defend 'against every man.'

III. 'The rights, honours, privileges and authority of the 'Holy Roman Church, and of their Lord the Pope, and his 'successors aforesaid, to be careful to preserve, defend, en-'large, and promote.'

IV. 'Heretics, schismatics, and rebels, against their said 'Lord, and his successors aforesaid, they will, to the ut-'most of their power, prosecute and oppose.'

V. 'Not to be concerned in any thing prejudicial to the 'Pope or Roman Church; but as far as they are able to pre-'vent the same.'

Such are the obnoxious clauses of the Bishops' consecration oath, in the midst of which is inserted in express words, a saving clause which speaks the dignity of Catholic Bishops, and reconciles their allegiance to their respective Sovereigns with the canonical obedience due to their head pastor. *Salvo meo ordine*—Saving my order. This clause does away every difficulty, and leaves the sceptre in the Prince's hands, whilst it leaves the censer in the hands of the Pontiff.

The oath then is but an oath of canonical obedience due from an inferior to a superior, in every church that acknowledges a Hierarchy. But an oath of allegiance is due to Temporal Princes alone; and doubtless the Bishops in the Pope's states can take both one and the other, for in those states they have no other Sovereign.

When then they bind themselves to preserve, defend, enlarge and promote the rights, honours, privileges and authority of the Roman Church and its Pontiff! Catholic Bishops mean their just rights, their just honours, their just privileges, and their just authority, which do not nor can extend to the overthrow of states, nor to the usurpation of the just and lawful rights, honours, privileges, and authority of others.

For an oath is not a tie of iniquity: an unjust oath taken to God himself is not binding; and an oath taken to one person to the prejudice of another is null and void. Hence the religious warrior in the Scripture, who in consequence of his oath offered up his daughter, offered to God a sacrilegious sacrifice. Herod, who bound himself by oath to give the young woman who danced in his presence, whatever she required, was guilty of murder in giving her the Prophet's head; and the Bishops would be guilty of robbery, treachery, and profanation, if they bound themselves by their consecration to dethrone their Sovereigns, plunder individuals, and disturb the peace and order of civil society, *to defend, enlarge, and promote the royalties of Saint Peter*, which are merely confined to a Spiritual Supremacy, and extend to no superiority in temporals. Let the form of words be what it

may, the Bishops never take that oath in any sense injurious to Sovereigns, nor to civil society. The Sovereign Pontiff knows they do not: before they are consecrated, they must swear allegiance to their respective Sovereigns, who are as jealous of their privileges as any Protestant Monarchs.

Oaths and laws are liable to interpretation; and one general rule prevails, that *a greater stress is to be laid on the sense than on the words.* The Bishops are not only the most competent judges of their own meanings, but moreover secure their own dignity, and the rights of their respective Sovereigns, by an express clause; *Salvo meo ordine*, saving my order, as a Bishop who receives his jurisdiction and the right of determining on doctrinal matters by his consecration, and not as a vassal or vicegerent of the Pope. *Salvo meo ordine*, Saving my order, as a subject bound to give Cæsar his due, and to pay allegiance to the reigning powers in whose states I reside. *Salvo meo ordine*, Saving my order, as a Minister of the Gospel, who is to preach the word, and who takes his oath in no other sense, than to prosecute by arguments, and impugn by persuasion, reason and good example, those who are of a different persuasion, and are willing to be convinced. Any other prosecution or persecution, let the term be what it may, is inconsistent with humanity, much more with the order of a Christian Prelate, who takes not, who cannot take the oath in any other sense. He cannot take the sword out of the hands of the civil magistrates, nor injure any description of men who are under the protection of the state.

Does the Lord Bishop of Cloyne mean to hold up the Catholic Prelates all over the world, as a set of perjurers? Are the Catholic Bishops in Germany, some of whom are Sovereign Princes, with numbers of religious descriptions in their states, are they perjurers?

This cavil at the Catholic Bishops' consecration oath, is but a dispute about words. They themselves know best in what sense they take it; and no Catholic Prelate on earth takes it in the sense which the Lord Bishop of Cloyne intimates to the public.

When the Proctors of the Court of Arches are sworn into

office, they bind themselves by oath, without any ‘ Salvo or ‘ reserving clause, never to impugn, diminish, or abridge the ‘ rights, liberties, or privileges of the church of Canterbury ‘ in manner whatever.’ *Quoquo Modo.*

Nunquam ad impugnationem, diminutionem, vel lœsionem juris, libertatis, vel privilegit Cantuariensis, Ecclesiæ postulabo; nec jus libertatem, vel privilegeium ejusdem Ecclesiæ QUOQUO MODO, *impugnabo*, &c. (vide *statuto de arcabus*, Stratford.) —Yet Oughton in his *ordo judiciorum, De causis testamentrus;* Titulus, 224, acknowledges that in certain cases they can decline the jurisdiction of the Court of Prerogative, though it is incumbent on them in such cases to proceed with the greatest and most delicate sincerity, in order not to incur the guilt of perjury, ‘ *Notandum tamen est quod expedit pro-* ‘ *curatori negaati jurisdictionem curiæ prærogativæ, bona et op-* ‘ *tima fide alias committit perjurium.*’

It is well known, that the prerogative courts claim jurisdiction in many cases in which the courts of common law deny them jurisdiction; yet it would be absurd to say that the Proctors of those prerogative courts are enemies to the laws of the realm, or perjure themselves in consequence of their oath, as it is absurd to imagine that Catholic Bishops are by their profession hostile to the rights and privileges of their respective Sovereigns, or perjure themselves by taking an oath of Canonical obedience. In the Prelate's oath, there is an express saving clause.—In the Proctor's oath there is no reserve, but such as justice and reason imply: all oaths must be reasonable and just. And in the interpretation of them, the intention of the swearers and of those to whom they are taken, and the sense in which both parties understand them, are to be strictly attended to.

The Lord Bishop of Cloyne then might with propriety have spared himself the trouble of alarming the public with the consecration oath of Catholic Prelates; especially as his own consecration oath is not favourable if literally taken for want of the dignified saving clause inserted in the oath of Catholic Bishops.

COPY OF THE LORD BISHOP OF CLOYNE'S CONSECRATION OATH.

(TAKEN FROM THE ENGLISH CARDINAL.)

The Archbishop's Interrogatory to the Bishop-Elect.

'ARE you ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and 'drive away all erroneous and all strange doctrines, contrary 'to God's word, and both privately and openly to call upon 'and encourage others to the same?

Answer. 'I am ready, the Lord being my helper.'

The reader may judge whether the above oath be not tantamount to prosecute and impugn Heretics and Schismatics. Nay, they go further; for the Catholic Prelate uses the dignified language of *Salvo meo ordine*, and does not bind himself to call upon and encourage others privately and openly to the same. What an alarming comment would not malevolent writers make on the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's consecration oath in those Protestant and Catholic States, where free toleration is granted, if they were as active in excluding the members of the church of England from national confidence, as the Lord Bishop of Cloyne has been in excluding Irish Dissenters and Catholics; or Counsellor Dominick Trant, who calls them *internal confederated enemies against the constitution.*

How these words *privately encouraging others*, would be tortured to the prejudice of the two Bishops, who were consecrated the other day in Lambeth Palace, in order to instruct their flocks in America, where unfettered conscience enjoys that innate freedom of which tests and penalties have deprived unhappy persecuted mortals!

The affinity of one oath with the other was so glaring, that it drew equal vengeance on the Bishops of the church of England, as well as on the Catholics, during those unhappy scenes which distracted England in the reign of Charles the First. Papists and Malignants were equally ob-

noxious to people who perceived such a thin partition between both, and similarity of ceremonies, mitres, confirmation, consecrations and oaths, scarce discernible.

What is the meaning of the words, to 'banish and drive 'away all erroneous and strange doctrines, and encourage 'others privately and openly to the same?' The Lord Bishop of Cloyne, who must believe that Bishops are *jure divino*, must believe the doctrine of the Dissenters strange and erroneous. The Lord Bishop of Cloyne, who believes that two sacraments are necessary to salvation, must believe the doctrine of the Quakers *strange and erroneous.* The Lord Bishop of Cloyne, who believes the Catholics to be Idolaters, violators of faith with Heretics, must believe their doctrine *enormously and horridly strange and erroneous.* What is then the consequence? That the Lord Bishop of Cloyne is bound to banish and drive away the Dissenters, Catholics, Quakers: in a word, all Adam's children who do not profess his creed. His pamphlet shews it: his Lordship hints to a dispensing power in the Church of Rome, I most earnestly recommend a dispensation with any oath, which deprives mortals of the rights to which they are entitled by nature, and which they have not forfeited by their personal crimes. He should then have left the consecration oath of Catholic Prelates, who in every age, have been an ornament to human nature by their philanthropy, their learning, and the purity of their lives; he should have left it where he found it, in an old Pontifical, on the shelf of a College Library, and foreseen that his own oath would be sought for in his ordinal, when he would examine into the oaths of others; if both are to be taken in the literal sense, they are very well matched, and should discover in each other's face a striking similiarity of features, such as ought to be between an elder and younger sister, to use the words of the ingenious Mr. Barber.

This affinity, however, has been very troublesome to the unhappy Catholics of England and Ireland, ever since the reign of Queen Elizabeth, to this very day. In Holland and Switzerland, Protestants and Catholics live together in the greatest harmony: in some parts of Germany, Calvinists, Lutherans, and Catholics, say their prayers in the same

church, each in their turn. And doubtless a passenger on earth may succeed another in a house of worship, to offer up a few prayers, as one traveller succeeds another at an Inn, and sits down at the same table on which another traveller had taken his repast an hour before. In Upper Alsatia, Protestants and Catholics study in the same University; and in Paris, the youth of all nations and religions may study the sciences, and attend what lectures they think fit, in the Universities and other Seminaries of learning, where quick parts and a comprehensive genius are attended to. But where students' religion is no matter of concern to a professor, who explain to his hearers either the Justinian code, or Hippocrates's aphorisms, or Quintilian's institutions, what reason to assign for disputes about religion in this kingdom, I am at a loss? 'Is the Pope more formidable 'here than in Holland, Switzerland, and other places more 'contiguous to Italy?' Is it on account of the difference of belief? The Catholic creed is the same all over the world: an Irish peasant believes neither more or less than a Fenelon or Bissuet. Is it on account of the Pope's all-dispensing power? Is his Omnipotence more prevalent here than elsewhere? Because the Catholic Clergy of Ireland do not choose to change their creed, does the Lord Bishop of Cloyne imagine they are so ignorant as to confound a Legate's letter, or a Pope's decree with the doctrine of the Catholic Church? History informs them that a Pope was excommunicated after his death, on a suspicion of having favoured the doctrine of the Monothelites; that Pope John the Twenty-second, was obliged to retract the doctrine which he preached at Avignon, where he asserted that the souls of the Saints were not to enjoy the beatific vision, or the clear sight of God before the last judgment; and that Popes were deposed by a Council, to put an end to disorder and schism: the Pope's infallibility then can be no part of their creed: they acknowledge him as the head pastor of their religion: but the pasturage on which he is to feed the flock, is not at his choice. The boundaries are prescribed, and under the controul of unalterable faith, and the Universal Canons of the church, he would not dare to remove the land-marks: if he attempted to publish the *Charter*

School Catechism, which (I am informed) was composed by, or compiled under the direction of the Lord Bishop of Cloyne, the Catholic body would depose him, and elect another in his room. Is it from dread of the Pope's deposing power, and the implicit obedience due to his mandates? Who can name a prince deposed by the Pope, in virtue of his spiritual authority? Can the prince be named who parted tamely with his crown, and opened his gates when St. Peter sounded the trumpet and ordered him to surrender? If in a memorable dispute between a Pope and an Emperor, about investitutes, the latter was worsted, it was a contest in which compacts and agreements were pleaded on both sides, and supported by powerful parties; but in this very contest have not Catholic subjects fought against the Pope in defence of their Sovereign? Have not the Catholic Barons and Clergy of England, with Archbishop Langton at their head, obtained the great charter of English liberty, in defiance of the threats, menaces, and excommunications of Pope Innocent the Third? Is it for any degeneracy peculiar to the Roman Catholic religion, which makes contemptible cowards of its votaries? The gallant Richard Cœur de lion, was the admiration of Europe and Asia; where James the First, whom the Lord Bishop of Cloyne admires for his wise saying *no Bishop, no King*, used to shut his eyes whenever he drew the sword to perform the ceremony of dubbing a Knight: is it for want of valour and heroism? The heroes of Agincourt and Cressi, who said their beads on the evening of those memorable battles, which will immortalize them in the annals of the world, were as brave as Marlborough, who was obliged to make a declaration of war against the Virgin Mary, before he could draw his sword in Flanders. Is it on account of the alloy of slavery, peculiarly blended with their profession?

When Attila flew over Italy like a vulture, a few Catholics, unable to resist by land, took shelter in the sea; and like the Halcyon that builds his nest on the calm surface of the water, in that very element they laid the foundation of a Republic, equally famous for preserving its liberties against the Popes of Rome, and the Turkish Emperors of Constantinople. Without any breach of faith, or rupture of Catholic communion, the keys of Saint Peter painted on the Pontiff's

Tiara, and the crescent raised on the top of the Saracen's turban, are equally obnoxious to Catholic republicans, if either nodded at any attempt against their liberties. Where then can the Lord Bishop of Cloyne find the truth of his assertion, that despotic States have found in the Papal authority a congenial system of arbitrary dominion? Has not the Temple of Liberty (from whose very corners he endeavours to exclude the natives of these realms,) been erected by Catholic hands, long before Langton could foresee that a Bishop would misrepresent his creed? Have not Catholic States opposed this Papal authority so congenial, according to the Lord Bishop of Cloyne, with the system of arbitrary dominion. Are not Protestant Monarchs as despotic as Catholic Kings? Does not the small Republic of Ragusa change its governor every month, lest a longer continuance in office would enable him to become the petty sovereign of a small territory? Where is this congeniality of Papal authority with arbitrary dominion, so interwoven with the frame of a Catholic creed as to make them inseparable? Or can a Bishop be so much a stranger to human nature, as to be ignorant of one of its most undeniable principles? One man resembles another, and every one chooses to be free.

SECTION THE FOURTH.

Containing Cursory Remarks on the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's Pamphlet.

Had I not seen the Reverend Mr. Barber's pamphlet, and got information that strictures on the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's publication are sent to the press, by a gentleman of more distinguished abilities than I can pretend to, I would examine his Lordship's possessions in every section of his work. Others have exempted me from the task. And my principal design was to enter into a full vindication of the Catholic body, and of myself, whom his Lordship's work is

calculated to render peculiarly obnoxious to the reigning powers.

After having committed himself with the Dissenters and Catholics, he makes a peculiar attack on the regular clergy by an innuendo, *that agitating friars and Romish missionaries may be sent here to sow sedition.* I challenged his Lordship in the public papers, and in the course of my defence, to produce one: he cannot: he hints that Theophilus may have some information of such. Let Theophilus appear, and he shall be branded as a lying witness. I am extremely sorry that his Lordship should mention such a slanderer in his pamphlet; as for my part, my landlord, Mr. Augustus Warren, a Member of Parliament, and a gentleman, who, at the very beginning of the disorders, took an active and honourable part in suppressing them, is now in town; he would not honour me with his friendship, nor give me free access to his house and library, whenever I chose to retire from the bustle of cities, if he discovered in me a seditious tenant. The regular clergy of this kingdom are a part of the Catholic body, whom they instruct and edify under the directions of the Catholic Prelates.

Does the Lord Bishop of Cloyne intend to raise a persecution against them, and thus, through their sides, to wound the Catholics at large, with whom they are so closely connected by the ties of blood, and the mutual interchange of good offices? They have not those fine gardens and rich monasteries which could excite the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's jealousy; and which the Emperor of Germany would sell to increase his treasury, as he has curtailed the revenues of such Bishops as are not foreign princes. The stricter their vow, the less cumbersome they are to society, as they are literally content with what Saint Paul was satisfied, *food and raiment;* many of them have left good fortunes to their younger brothers: all have renounced their share of the inheritance; and such of them as had but a small dividend to share, made a generous sacrifice, when they renounced all earthly prospects. Should the contempt of the vanities of the world, and a disinterested heart, be deemed objects of censure in ecclesiastics, they should not be held in such a view by a Bishop, who finds them recommended in the Scrip-

tures. Neither will they ever be deemed such by the laity, who will esteem the clergy the more in proportion as they practise what they preach. I write here of the regular clergy of Ireland, who run the same career with the rest of the Catholic clergy of the kingdom, and whose common ancestors fell prostrate in the promiscuous ruin, occasioned by confiscations and forfeitures. If a revival of claims, so often mentioned in the senate, and bandied about in flying pamphlets, can tend to render them obnoxious, there is no doubt, but that they should be objects of jealousy with the rest of the Catholics, should those claims be ever asserted. For the Catholic clergy, both secular and regular, are descended from the same stock with the Catholic laity, and from ancestors who in their days were neither hewers of wood nor drawers of water. But those claims I have done away by scripture, canon and civil law, and reason, in my address to the common people, when the combined fleets were on our coasts, and a revival most likely to ensue. For, at that time, the unprotected Catholic had nothing to lose, and on each Catholic clergyman's head hung the naked sword of proscription. I had some time before confirmed the throne in his Majesty's family, against the claims of Stuarts, Bourbons, and the House of Sardinia. This I have done in my *Loyalty asserted*, as far as a writer possessed of abilities, which have nothing to recommend them but the sincerity of the author, could confirm the throne of a prince, whose Catholic subjects are compared to a *pack of hounds*, impatient to run down the *Royal Game*.

The only reward I expect for my labour, is not to be insulted by any oblique insinuation, that I am sent here to sow sedition. The Lord Bishop of Cloyne softens the innuendo in these words, *I do not say that Mr. O'Leary is sent here to sow sedition;* but, &c. If he did not say it, why mention my name as a dessert, after having regaled his reader with so many courses? *Sent here!* I imagined that St. Paul recommends hospitality to Bishops, and that a Prelate would be more generous than to envy an Irishman the liberty of breathing his native air. If Swift were alive, he would not be very thankful to the Lord Bishop of Cloyne; but Swift would be at liberty to indulge his thoughts in their full latitude; I

must be cautious, under the heaviest provocation. The Lord knows that it is hard for me! I was not *sent here!* I came *here*, after having been forced in my early days into foreign countries, for a small portion of education, which was refused me in the land of my fathers, because I would not couple Tully's Orations with a Charter-School Catechism.

I was not sent here to sow sedition: I returned here, not as a fellon from transportation, but as an honourable exile, who returns to his native land, after having preferred a voluntary banishment, to ignorance and the abjuration of the creed of his fathers.

I appeal to Richard Longfield, Esq. Member of Parliament, whether, at the very beginning of the disturbances in the diocese of Cloyne, I have not given the sincerest proof of the most unfeigned determination to co-operate in the restortion of peace and tranquillity. That gentleman soon suppressed the tumults in his own district: because the humanity of the landlord gave an additional weight of respect and love to the authority of the magistrate. I say it not from flattery, to which I am an utter stranger: had all the gentlemen of consequence in the county of Cork, exerted themselves as Mr. Richard Longfield and Mr. Augustus Warren have done; had they, in imitation of the above-mentioned gentlemen, rendered their authority as amiable from benevolence to their tenants, as it was formidable from the powers invested in them by the laws, the disturbances would not have outlived the space of six weeks. Wherever the landlords were active and generous, and advised the people, either no disorders appeared, or were soon suppressed; and had the Lord Bishop of Cloyne been as active in visiting his diocese, and publishing pastoral letters, as he was intent upon collecting materials for a pamphlet, to surprise the public on the eve of the meeting of Parliament, he would have contributed to the prevention or suppression of the tumults in concurrence with Mr. O'Leary.

But the Lord Bishop of Cloyne was secure in the protection of the state. The peace of society was left to the other guardians: the people were wretched, miserable, and mad:

several gentlemen were not much concerned for the injuries offered to the clergy of either religion; policy, which often expects benefits from popular commotions so destructive to the simple, might have induced others to remain silent and inactive in the prospect of providing for their adherents, under the extension of a general police bill; a bill which was then expected in consequence of popular tumults, which adepts in political wisdom, were more active in magnifying than preventing. It was reported in the city of Cork, that a certain Reverend Gentleman in the diocese of Cloyne* used to go in the night-time with armed men to sound a horn near a cluster of cabins, in order to make prisoners of such as would appear to gratify their curiosity; an expedient well becoming a minister of the Gospel! But with some persons every expedient is justifiable, when *Popish plots* are to be contrived to give it a sanction: but every idea of such plots is done away, by the very resolves of the Gentlemen and Freeholders of the county of Cork: resolves wherein they censure the inactivity and inexertions of many magistrates and gentlemen of property, on the breaking out of the disturbances, and on the continuance of them.†

It would have been no difficult matter to have smothered them in their birth, as I remarked in my narrative. Firmness and humanity would have prevented the disorder. I recommended it in the beginning. For were I a man in power, I never would take for my guides, Rehoboam counsellors; *My father whipped you with rods, I will whip you with scorpions.* I recommended it in presence of the present Earl of Carhampton, then Lord Lutterell. It was happy for the ill-fated Catholics that such a nobleman of his character, for honour and impartiality, was on the distracted spot. It was happy for them that the Representatives in Parliament for the County and City, and other members who reside in the South of Ireland, are acquainted with local circumstances, and well known for honour, justice and humanity. Other-

* Perhaps the Author of the Letter found on the road from Cork to Clonaghkilty, and addressed to Doctor O'Leary, by William O'Driscoll.

† County of Cork meeting, 7th December, 1786.

wise Government would have been imposed on, and the Catholics of Ireland would be in a worse state in the year eighty-seven, than they had been in the year forty-five.

The county of Cork meeting agreed to a resolution, which may serve as a rule well adapted to the times of commotions arising from distress. Resolved, that as we are determined to punish all violators of the public peace, so we are equally desirous to aid in redressing any persons who shall appear to us to be really aggrieved. Both wisdom and humanity penned that resolution. Had it been entered into, and carried into execution in the month of September or October eighty-five, instead of the seventh of December, in the year eighty-six, the county would have been quieted a long time before. *Do not strike until you listen*, was a maxim with an Athenian General. It is better to listen in time, than to strike when the mischief is done: it was my maxim from the beginning. The Lord Bishop of Cloyne would have acted in a manner more consistent with his character, in enforcing that maxim than in publishing a pamphlet, every page of which can be controverted by the Dissenters and Catholics of Ireland. Nay, his favourite plan about tithes and commutations is found defective by the most sensible writers of his own communion. From the beginning to the last line of his pamphlet, he cannot support an argument without forcing the Catholics into his subjects. In the forty-seventh page, he describes the regular clergy in the following manner: 'the regular clergy 'of the church of Rome, indeed, belong to a separate body, 'with an interest distinct from the general weal; claiming 'an exemption from the public taxes, and the civil jurisdic-'tion of their own country; and avowing a subjection to a 'foreign power, were and are a natural object of jealousy 'and apprehension.' Mr. Standish, the Hearth-money collector in Cork, can refute the assertion; if I had his receipts in Dublin, I would place them in my appendix, with those of my landlord's and my tailor's bill; for the money I get circulates amongst the public.

The Lord Bishop of Cloyne, in a catechism, *printed under his direction, (as I am told,) impresses the tender and uncautious minds of foundlings with a notion that violation of faith with and extirpation of heretics, indulgences for committing sins in the ensuing course of a man's life, and license for guilt, are articles of the Catholic faith. The compiler of such a catechism may misrepresent the regular clergy with every freedom. He must then certainly mean the regular clergy in foreign countries, of whose state he is as incompetent a judge as I am of the regulations of Westminster School, which I have never seen.

The regular clergy have no interest distinct from the general weal. They are as much interested in the preservation of the state, from which they have got their lands and monasteries, as the Lord Bishop of Cloyne is interested in the preservation of Ireland, where he has very good livings. He would have, I suppose, the regular clergy of the church of Rome to shoulder a firelock, sound horns, and shoot Whiteboys. In every age since their institution, they have been engaged in a more glorious warfare, civilizing barbarous nations, diffusing the light of the gospel into remote regions, whither the Alexanders and Cæsars had never carried their arms, contributing extensively to the culture of the sciences, and swelling the deep and majestic rivers of European literature, with their tribute of the knowledge of the histories, laws, customs and manners of the most remote and distant nations. I do not talk here of the Jesuits alone, who in the very centre of barbarism, amongst cannibals, feeding on each other's flesh, realize the sublime ideas of a Plato, a Sir Thomas More, or a Fenelon. Those great men only dreamt of those political institutions under which

* In that Catechism there is not one word of the commandments of God, nor explanation of any moral duty. The honour of the nation cries aloud to the right honourable and honourable the Trustees of the Protestant Schools, to order some unprejudiced person to compose another Catechism: for besides the horrid and unchristian doctrines falsely imputed to the Catholics, in that Christian doctrine there are two historical untruths.---First, that a hundred thousand Protestants were massacred in Ireland.—Secondly, that Protestants are not tolerated in Catholic States. If that Catechism were seen in foreign countries, what an opinion would be formed of our early education!

man could live happy, without the canker of envy or the stings of poverty. A branch of the regular clergy of the church of Rome raised the fabric, which procured them the compliments of Montesquieu, and the admiration of the world. Civilized and christian Paraguay, from a nation of Cannibals, became the only spot on earth where vice and want were equally unknown.

To this very day the Catholic religion is maintained in Turkey land, Abyssinia, and the remotest regions, by the labours of men whom their vows and a generous contempt of the pleasures of this world naturalize to every nation and climate. Their method is quite different from that prescribed by the Lord Bishop of Cloyne for the propagation of the Gospel; a method which exposes religion to the derision of infidels, and renders the proposer vulnerable to every arrow which can be taken from the quivers of the learned. His Lordship informs us gravely that his religion will extend *in proportion to agriculture.* Bravo! this is literally planting the Gospel, and making it the religion of the land, in every sense of the word: Saint Paul says that godliness is great gain. The Lord Bishop writes as if gain were great godliness: he sanctifies the soil before he sanctifies the soul; pity that crows and pigeons have not the use of speech as they had in Æsop's time! His clergy would have a great number of fellow-labourers in the Lord's vineyard. The feathered tribe would cry out to the peasant, *my good man, sow the corn, and I will be with you next year to reclaim you from the errors of Popery.*

The next method his Lordship proposes is an effort on the part of Government to bring the Irish language into disuse, in order to save his clergy the trouble of learning it. This method is an insult to the natives, and cannot come with any propriety from a prelate, who (if I be well informed) is indebted for his promotion to the descendant of Irish princes, in whose hospitable halls the tuneful lyre was strung up to Irish melody, so varied and harmonious that the lying Giraldus Cambrensis was forced to speak of it with rapture and ecstasy. But now, at the awful summons of an English prelate, the Irish harp must be suspended on the branch of some weeping willow, as the Israelites hung up

their musical instruments on the mulberry-trees that grew on the banks of the rivers of Babylon. *How can we sing* (used they to say) *the canticles of the Lord in a strange land?* And the Irishman can say, *How can I speak the language of my fathers in the land of my nativity?* His language must be abolished at the recommendation of the Right Reverend Doctor Woodward; this language, the study of which the learned Leibnitz and Lhuid so warmly recommended to the curious inquirers into the monuments of antiquity; this language, studied by a learned stranger,* who has reconciled Mars with Minerva, in uniting the sword with the pen, military skill with literary powers, and by his learned labours has rescued from obscurity the history of a misrepresented nation, formerly the Athens of western Europe: thus Cæsar studied astronomy in the camp, whilst the priests of Apollo snored in the temple. A military gentleman studies the Irish language, to increase the store of the literary public. The prelate, whose function it is to sanctify the souls of the natives, recommends the growth of their grain for the food of the clergyman's body, and the abolition of their language for the good of their souls.

Thus the Irish peasant must work double tides to sail for heaven. He must grow corn for an English pastor's body, and study this English parson's language for the good of his own soul, lest a pair of brogues would be too uncourtly a dress to appear in the antichamber of heaven. *Badinage apart.* Such a recommendation for the abolition of languages should rather come from a leader of Goths and Vandals, whose glory it was to destroy monuments of literature, than from the Bishop of a large diocese, in a philosophical age, when curiosity is on the wing, and the mind active in the pursuit of knowledge. The Lord Bishop's method then of propagating his gospel is the most extraordinary that I ever read of; to sow corn and extend agriculture for the conveniency of the clergyman, and to oblige the peasant, after the toils of the day, to learn the clergyman's language, in order to know the way to heaven, which the clergyman would not

* Colonel Vallancey.

take the pains of telling him in Irish. A true repetition of Erasmus's echo, *Quid est sacerdotiam?* Echo. *Otium.*

I have read of a Saracen emperor, who, from hatred to literature, burnt the Alexandrian library; but I never read of a Christian prelate intent upon the conversion of people by whom he was fed, who, instead of learning their language, recommended its disuse, until I read the pamphlet of the Lord Bishop of Cloyne. The present Bishop of Llandaff could not speak a word of Welch when he came to Wales. Instead of recommending to the English government to abolish the Welch language, he made the knowledge of it his peculiar study. But it is the unhappy and singular fate of the Catholics of Ireland to see their names held up as barbarous, their creed misrepresented, and the language of their ancestors threatened with entire disuse, for the gratification of a foreign prelate, who proposes, as the means of their sanctification, commodious houses and cultivated spots for the ease and convenience of persons whom his Lordship dispenses with the trouble of even learning the language of the people who support them.

This was not the manner in which the regular clergy of the church of Rome planted religion in all the nations on earth where they preached the gospel. Neither was it the method which those who separated from the church of England, adopted to establish their own doctrine, and formed separate communions. They learned the language of the people, and brought them over to their way of thinking, before they insisted upon commodious houses and glebe lands. Hence they became ministers of the world; whereas, according to the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's plan, making religion and agriculture keep pace with each other, he gives his readers to understand that the minister of religion is more the minister of the *soil* than of the *soul:* and that the old adage, which is become so current to the disgrace of the priesthood, is verified, *no penny no paternoster.*

But leaving the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's method of propagating his doctrine by tithes, glebe-houses, and the annihilation of languages, exposed to the shafts of christian criticism; let us return to his charge against the regular clergy.

His Lordship says, that they claim an exemption from public taxes, and from the civil jurisdiction of their own country, and avow a subjection to a foreign power.*

I am surprised that his Lordship would advance such charges in my neighbourhood. He cannot mean the regular clergy of Ireland. As to the regular clergy in Catholic countries; they enjoy no exemption but what the state grants, as the Bishop of Cloyne enjoys no exemption but what the state grants to himself. Does he pretend to prescribe laws to Catholic states; or to controul their power to grant what exemptions they think fit to the children, not only of noblemen and gentlemen, but to the children of princes? For the annals of religion and the history of religious orders can inform him, that from the days of Saint Basil to this very day, the regular clergy can mark numbers of such a description in their calendar. The regular clergy then plead no exemption but what he pleads himself; the exemption granted by the state wherein they live. He should not envy in others what he himself enjoys; for I suppose it is from the state he enjoys the privilege of pleading the *scandalum magnatum*, when Richard Woodward, now my Lord Bishop of Cloyne, gives such a provocation to Arthur O'Leary, as to become the eulogist and apologist of a Theophilus, who calls him a Friar with a barbarous sirname, and to recommend the disuse of the language of his ancestors.

The regular clergy, whether here or elsewhere, avow no subjection to a foreign power: they live as corporate societies, under their peculiar institutions confirmed by church and state; the boundaries are kept distinct: they give God what belongs to God, and to Cæsar his due: whilst they live as a corporated society, they will plead their charter. Thence, the Pope himself, cannot in an arbitrary manner, either elect or depose their superiors, or interfere in their religious polity: he may annul their charter, but whilst they live as corporate societies, they will maintain their institutions which contain nothing obnoxious either to church or state: otherwise neither would give them a sanction. When they make their vows, it is not to become vassals to the Pope. It is to

* Page 48.

gratify their own devotion under regulations, which at a competent age they have twelve months probation either to adopt or reject.

They avow no subjection to a foreign power; and I call upon the Lord Bishop of Cloyne to prove his assertion. They are subjects of the state, swear allegiance to their Prince, and are as faithful as any other subjects. Trapolo, a regular, defended the privileges of his country, against Pope Paul the Fifth, and immortalized his name. Ximenes, a regular, raised the power of the Spanish monarchy, and paved the way for the splendid conquests of Charles the Fifth. Father Joseph de la Tremblay, after quitting the bar, and becoming a regular, was forced from his cloister to direct the councils of Lewis XIII. He planned those measures in the execution of which Richlieu appeared as the ostensible agent, and which by humbling the House of Austria, and lopping off the heavy branches which made the tree of the French monarchy bend too much, gave it that erect posture and firmness, which ever since have been proof against so many storms. In Ireland, during the unhappy commotions which distracted this kingdom in the reign of Charles the First, who could have exerted himself with more constancy than Father Peter Walsh, mentioned with honour in the continuation of Sir James Ware? Did not he oppose Rimuccini, the Pope's Legate, who afterwards excommunicated him at Brussels? Under his excommunication he remained unshaken in his loyalty. Or what is there in a regular clergyman's frame so hostile to his country, as to induce the Lord Bishop of Cloyne to hold him forth as avowing a subjection to a foreign power? Is not a man's oath to be believed? And when the regular clergy swear allegiance to their King, is not their oath to be relied on? But the Lord Bishop of Cloyne has favoured us with a very nice distinction. He acknowledges that in the ordinary transactions of life between man and man, the oath of a Catholic may be relied on; but when his church is in danger, then he may slacken the reins and bear down the wounds of sincerity.

Where has the Lord Bishop of Cloyne discovered this distinction? Where have the Catholics taught that the

work of Heaven is to be promoted by the agency of Hell? Is the Christian religion to be promoted by fraud, profanation, and perjury? Does he really believe that the Catholics are ignorant of that maxim of Saint Paul, *evil is not to be done that good may arise from it? Non sunt facienda mala uteveniant bona.* Or does he forget that the scandalous distinction between the oath of a Catholic, in the ordinary transactions of life, and the oath in which his religion is concerned, has been condemned by the Catholic Church, ages before it could be foreseen that a Bishop or any other mortal would charge her with such a doctrine? This very distinction was the doctrine of Priscillian, who taught his disciples that perjury on the score of religion was lawful: he was condemned by the council of Toledo, and burnt alive. Speaking of the Catholics he says, *that men are better than their tenets.* It may be so: in Sparta it was a tenet that every deformed child should be exposed and abandoned to his fates. Parental affection in some might have eluded such a rigorous law, and thus proved that they were *better than their tenets.* It was *a tenet* amongst the inhabitants of the Isle of Cyprus, that married women should prostitute themselves once a year in the Temple of Venus. I doubt not but conjugal affection and female modesty, operated with some to such a degree as to induce them to detest the *tenet;* but I do not believe that there is this day on earth, any sect of Christians half so good as their *tenets.* They may differ in speculative points, but the principles of morality are the same. However, the Lord Bishop of Cloyne is best acquainted with his own *tenets,* and if they be as charitable as himself, his neighbours should entertain a good opinion of his rule of faith. However, if the horrors of violation of faith with heretics, &c. be articles of orthodoxy, certainly not only some Catholics, but all Catholics, are better than their *tenets;* and without any disparagement to his rank or dignity, he will find thousands amongst them as honest, upright, and honourable as himself, not only from innate principles, but from the very tenor of their creed.

He alarms the Dissenters with the apprehensions, that if they do not assist him in keeping the tithes, the Catholic

clergy will have them with the assistance of a foreign power. Mr. Barber ingeniously answers, that it is equal to him who has the tithes, whether it be *Peter, Martin, or John*, when they are of no benefit to him either with regard to soul or body. If his Lordship be afraid that the Catholic clergy will deprive him of all the tithes, with the assistance of a foreign power: I can assure him that he has nothing to apprehend: not from foreign powers, who will never invade Ireland in order to procure the tithes for the Catholic clergy: this indeed, would be a war of proctors and tithe-canters. Further, I can assure his Lordship, that foreign powers are more inclined to reduce the revenues of their own national clergy, than to make war for the Catholic clergy of Ireland. But do not the Catholic clergy believe that tithes are *jure divino?* By no means: whoever reads Father Paul, and Father Simon, upon benefices, will soon discover that tithes are not due to the Christian priesthood by Gospel law. These two were Catholic authors. Bishop Barlow and Selden, amongst the Protestants proved the same. I would not mention a word about them, had I not been forced into the field with the Bishop's foreign powers, and Theophilus's *jure divino;* and shall say of them but very little: they were not known in the western church, until about the seventh or eighth century. The clergy had influence at that time to prevail on the French kings to give a sanction to the sixth commandment of the church; *Thou shalt pay tithes to the clergy:* this was a law of discipline, liable to change with the times, and of no force but from the sanction of the secular power, for a moral and natural right founded on the words, the *labourer is worthy of his hire;* is all that a clergyman can plead. In the Greek church tithes are not known to this very day, and in the African church, Saint Augustine would not permit his own church to be endowed, foreseeing the bad effects of the riches of the clergy. However, in the west, the pious laity, with the sanction of the power of the state, endowed each church under the strict obligations that three dividends should be made; one for the support of the clergyman; the second, for the reparation of the church; and the third, for the relief of the poor. Such was the original institution; some alterations must have been

since made in the manner of carrying into execution the founder's intentions; for the part that was originally destined for the relief of the poor, now goes to the proctor. And as to reparation of churches, had the Whiteboys burnt the new church, if the old church had not been left to them for a chapel, or hath both churches fallen to the ground, I am humbly of opinion that his Lordship of Cloyne would sooner apply for a parliamentary grant, than be at the expense of contributing the third part of his tithes towards the repair of the fabric. Many and refined have been the improvements on this simple institution of ecclesiastical revenues.

One would be disposed to believe that there was a certain magic in the number *ten*. The tenth lamb, the tenth pig, the tenth chicken, the tenth sheaf, every thing was decimated: every tenth animal that did not grow to the size of a calf, was consecrated to the clergy, *except the tenth orphan*. Peas, beans, all kinds of garden stuff, were surveyed in the name of *God and the Church;* and the clergy were compared to the locusts of the revelations, devouring all kinds of herbs that came in their way, except such *as were noxious*. As theological disputes divided them in the interim, their divisions divided unluckily the flocks, and what was more, divided the affections of the people. Under various changes of creeds, the lucrative system remained unaltered. Pope Alexander the Third was the first who issued excommunications for the recovery of tithes, and decreed that the labours of the industrious bee should contribute to the support of the Lord's anointed. He ordained that every tenth bee-hive should be sequestered for the use of the church. The clergy of the established religion in England and Ireland, who borrowed their pomp, their splendour and hierarchy from the church of Rome, declared from their pulpits, that the Pope was Antichrist. Yet in reforming the religion of Rome, they improved upon Pope Alexander's system, by insisting upon the tithes of agistment;* and thus raised the claim from a bee to a bullock. If Pope Alexander thundered out his excommunications on the score of tithes, they fired

* This barbarous word, so familiar to our Irish Canonists, is derived from an old French word, signifying to drive a beast into a field.

blunderbusses in defence of those remnants of Popery; and dead bodies were seen laid prostrate in fields, in consequence of contests for consecrated goods, which in former ages the pious laity had destined for the support of the living. Whatever the clergy possess by law, is certainly their right, and should be secured to them; but when people argue, they should be careful not to advance paradoxes; and that the right to tithes is anterior to the title of any layman to his land, is a paradox indeed. The land was inhabited by the laity before St. Patrick preached the Gospel. What he and his successors got was a free gift of the donors; and no man in his senses will deny that the supreme powers of the state have a right to alter any system, for the peace and good of the community: I shall discuss no further the subject of tithes, as it has been already and will be hereafter discussed by abler pens: if I summed up in a few lines their rise and progress, it is to shew the futility of the charge that the Catholic clergy are intent upon recovering the tithes of this kingdom, with the assistance of foreign powers, as if they were due *jure divino*. Could such an idle thought occur to any man who did not intend to sport with common sense? Will any man of sense believe that the formidable forces of France and Spain would be poured, at vast expenses, into this kingdom, in order to reinstate a few Catholic clergymen in the tithes of potatos, oats, hay, &c. I am ashamed to make further comments. The Catholic clergy resuming tithes with the assistance of foreign powers! Lay-improprietors threatened with the loss of the abbey-lands which would revert to the regular clergy! When the Reformation was but in its infancy, and no religion in England at the time, but veered at the breath of each succeeding Monarch, what became of the abbey-lands? In the short space that intervened between the dissolution of abbeys and the reign of Queen Mary, there was not sufficient time to found the title of prescription, which by the civil law requires a space of thirty years for immovables. When that Queen ascended the throne several of the abbots and priors whose monasteries had been dissolved were living. Were not all the abbey-lands confirmed to the lay-possessors by Cardinal Pole, with full authority from the Pope. And

now, under a Protestant Sovereign, after a lapse of more than two centuries, a prelate raises the alarm against persons who thought as little of depriving him of his tithes, or the lay gentlemen of their impropriations, as the inoffensive citizen thought of depriving of his life a suspicious prince, who, in his uneasy slumbers, dreamed that he cut his throat, and put the innocent man to death.

I am in no manner concerned in tithes, but I appeal to to his Lordship whether, at different times, they have not been the occasion of popular commotions? Whether, at different times, the cottager who plants the potato, and the farmer who commits the grain to the earth, does not realize the fable of the man *who sowed the dragon's teeth, which afterwards vegetated into armed men?* Whether an honourable support, free from litigations and wrangles with parishioners of every description, would not comport more with the dignity of the clerical profession? And whether this be not the opinion and wish of the most sensible clergymen of the established religion? If I am asked the reason why I should interfere in tithes? I answer, that the radical cause of the distemper being not removed, it may break out at some future period; and that when the bramble shoots from the sod which will cover me, the wrangles of oppressed peasants may be construed into *a Popish confederacy.*

His Lordship endeavours to refute the Bishop of Llandaff's arguments by the disparity of circumstances, as the number of the Dissenters of both communions is greater in Ireland. I take the liberty of asking him one question—is it because there is less to do, that the salary of the labourer must be increased at the expense of the cottager? Does he really believe that an honest Dissenter will be saved? Does he believe that an honest Catholic will be saved? If he does, why this zeal for conversion which alarms the nation? It is equal to any state whether the hand that steers the plough crosses the forehead or not, provided the man be honest and industrious. He complains of the zeal of the Catholic Laity to make converts, and the supineness of the Protestant gentlemen in not converting Catholics. Will he have a Protestant landlord turn missionary, and invade the episcopal functions? If his

Lordship be so zealous for the salvation of the people, why not learn their language? The Catholic missionaries who penetrated into the vast empire of China, learned the Chinese, though there are eight hundred letters in the alphabet, and each letter stands for a word. They converted millions of the people, translated the writings of their philosophers, and brought Europe acquainted with the laws, customs and morals of that singular country. His Lordship is not under the necessity of travelling far to learn the language; it is at his door: and an English pastor may as well learn the Irish as Colonel Vallancey, an English officer. His Lordship will excuse this freedom—it is as a writer who called me forth that I address him throughout: my respect for a Bishop's character is a restraint which I would shake off, if a person of an inferior rank called on Government to bring into disuse the language of a country. It is what conquerors themselves seldom have done. The polished Frenchman has never attempted to abolish the low dialect of the Breton; the grave Spaniard leaves the Biscayen to the use of his speech; and the English have not abolished the Welsh or Erse: the Irish must have the badge of scorn. As to conversions made by the Catholic laity, I do not find it an easy matter: fasts, confession of sins, the belief of mysteries which surpass and seem to contradict the very senses, penal laws and legal disqualifications, are no great inducements to conversion. Suppose that a Protestant, struck with the same arguments which made some German princes, Chillingworth and Dryden, to embrace the Catholic faith; suppose a Protestant of any sect became a Catholic, the Lord Bishop of Cloyne, upon the very principles of the Reformation, which allows freedom of thought and the right of private judgment, could not in equity censure him. Every one is free to embrace the religion that seems best to him. It is the privilege of nature; and a convert to the Catholic religion is sufficiently punished by a conformity that deprives him almost of every privilege. Many a learned man has quitted the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's communion. The famous Whiston wrote to the Archbishop of York and Canterbury, assigning the reasons of his separation from the

church of England. And not long ago Lindsay resigned his benefice, in order to offer up his prayers to one God in one person, and expunged the name of Christ from the collect. The Lord Bishop of Cloyne would make a more glorious conquest in reclaiming Doctor Priestly and Lindsay, than if he converted a hundred Irish peasants. I see no reason for alarming the nation with the danger of the church. Little did the world imagine a few centuries ago that a single German friar would have shaken the pontifical throne, and brought about the most astonishing revolution that the world ever beheld. Ever since that memorable æra the Protestant religion, from a small beginning, is rapidly increasing. When there were Catholic kings on the throne, it gained ground. It is then very much out of season now to alarm three kingdoms with the news that at this moment the church of Ireland is in imminent danger of subversion.

The Lord Bishop of Cloyne believes two Sacraments necessary to salvation. If he could gain over to the established church all the inhabitants of Ireland who believe that neither is necessary to salvation, it would be a great acquisition to the established religion. His Lordship adverts to the total indifference of many for every kind of religion. Could he but kindle the flames of piety and fervor in the breasts of such people, it would be of infinite advantage. And if he could keep within the pale of the established church, such as are willing to form modes of worship for themselves, or reclaim such as have quitted it within those many years without becoming Catholics, he would leave no room to complain of the majority of Dissenters. What a field is open here for pastoral zeal! It is a Herculean task indeed, and worthy of a prelate of distinguished abilities. But want of Baptism, Deism, separation from the established church, and altar against altar, cannot draw forth the pen of the Lord Bishop of Cloyne. The stability of tithes and the downfal of Popery are his only themes. The wag on the stage received many a plaudit, who, on being asked his religion, answered that he loved *a pot of porter, and hated popery.*——Let a Theophilus abuse Catholics and revile Mr. O'Leary; he is called an able writer in the beginning, and

excused on the score of his apprehensions for the safety of religion at the end of a pamphlet. Cargoes of abstracts against popery are daily imported from England; luckily they arrive out of season; for the nation knows the purport of them. If violation of faith with heretics be the reason of the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's attack, the Catholics disclaim it on oath. And whoever does not believe the oath of an honest man, deserves no answer. There is address and ingenuity in laying so often a stress upon the word heretics. When mentioned by the Lord Bishop of Cloyne, it conveys an idea that the Catholics alone consider those who are reared out of their church as heretics. His Lordship will, I hope, have the generosity to divide the imputation with Mr. O'Leary. Does the church of England acknowledge that there are no heretics? Have not her bishops pronounced them as such after a canonical trial? Has not the civil magistrate, nursed in her bosom, doomed them to the fagot? The inquisition could do no more: for the ecclesiastical judge barely confines himself to a declaration that such doctrine is heretical. The magistrate, armed with the power of the law, pronounces sentence, and sees it carried into execution.

Doctor Godolphin, a Protestant canonist, in his Abridgement of the Ecclesiastical Laws of England, after Sir Edward Coke, calls heresy *a leprosy of the soul*;* and gives a description of no less than one hundred and thirty-seven heresies. If he was now living he could add to the catalogue many new doctrines, which the Lord Bishop of Cloyne would declare *strange and erroneous* by his consecration oath. Human victims were seen marching to the stake with fagots on their backs to purge in the flames the pollution of heresy, under a Protestant Elizabeth and a Protestant James, as under a half Catholic Henry and a Catholic Mary. And those *strange and erroneous* doctrines which the Lord Bishop of Cloyne promises by his consecration oath to banish and drive away, banished and drove away effectually Dissenters

* Godolphin Repertorium Canonicum.

and Catholics into the wilds of America, in the reign of that James, whom the Lord Bishop of Cloyne applauds for his wise saying, No Bishop no King. Those *strange and erroneous* doctrines, banished and drove away the Catholic *Lord Baltimore*, into Maryland, for bowing at the name of Jesus; and that great *Penn*, who deserved half the world, for teaching Sovereigns how to govern the other. They banished and drove away Penn into Pennsylvania, for not bowing at all; for having rejected the ceremony of the hat, and wearing a few flat buttons on a plain unornamented coat. Those two great men, persecuted for their *strange erroneous doctrines*, and still diametrically opposite in religious principles, planted their colonies where they granted free toleration to all mortals; and where is man now restored to the indelible charter, which the free-born mind is entitled to plead. They resembled the two brave soldiers, who were always quarrelling by the instigation of their comrades, without knowing why. A general rout came on, in the flight they both fell into a deep pit. Said one, if I kill you, what shall I benefit by your death? Your putrified body will stifle me. The other retorted in the same tone; they saw the common danger, and agreed; one leaped on the shoulders of the other, and reached the verge of the pit, out of which he helped his fellow sufferer. They both retired in peace, and lived ever after in amity. Lord Baltimore and Penn did the same.

The recollection of such melancholy scenes induces me to applaud my Lord Bishop of Cloyne, for declaring in his introduction, that it is not his object to enter into the defence of ecclesiastical establishments in general. It would be a heavy task indeed, since the beginning of ecclesiastical establishments until of late, sovereigns seduced by the counsels of the clergy, became the executioners of their subjects. The ministers of a religion, one of whose principal laws is a law of eternal love, became the apologists of calamities, that swept from the face of the earth, or oppressed to this very day, God's noblest images, upright, virtuous, and dauntless men. Like the warrior in the Scriptures, they stept into the sanc-

tuary to grasp the barbarian's sword wrapt up in the ephod. The code of temporal laws, teeming with sanctions against robbers and murderers, was swelled to the surprise and destruction of mankind, with additional decrees against heretics and papists. The inoffensive citizen, who from an apprehension of offending the deity, by acting against his conscience, was confined in the same dungeon, or doomed to the fagot or axe with the parricide, who laid aside every restraint of moral obligation. The scriptures were adduced in justification of the sanguinary confusion. Out of every contested verse there issued a fury armed with a quibble and a poniard, who inspired mankind at once with folly and cruelty, and Europe became one wild altar, on which every religious sect offered up human victims to its creed. Such are the effects of ecclesiastical establishments in a long succession of ages. The effects ascribed to them by the right reverend author, as infusing morality as a collateral aid to the check of the law, would have been produced in a more heavenly manner, by religion uncontrouled by the terror of penal sanctions; and its rays never shone brighter than when its ministers had no other sword to enforce it, but the two edged sword of the peaceful doctrine of its Author. It is not then to the lenity of ecclesiastical establishment, that men are indebted for the freedom they enjoy, but to the lenity of the state; and to the exalted souls and enlarged minds of the illustrious senators, who have cast off the sable weeds of priestly bigotry, to put on the bright and radient livery of enlightened reason, which religion enlarges into an extensive asylum, instead of contracting into a narrow and favourite spot, which it is penal (but for a few) to look at. The gloom which the Lord Bishop of Cloyne's pamphlet has spread on every countenance, and the mutual distrust and jealousy which have succeeded the strictest sincerity and amity since the publication of his performance, are no mighty recommendations of ecclesiastical establishments: The blood of fifty millions of men, cut off by the sword of persecution, since the state unsheathed it in defence of ecclesiastical establishments: The oppression, banishment and imprisonment of many more! The blood of the slain cries under the altar, to the powers of the earth,—*Leave your*

subjects free.—Let the priests pray; but do not draw the sword in defence of their prayers; for they will never pray alike.

I should never have mentioned tithes, lest any of the established clergy should imagine I envied them what in former times belonged to the Catholic clergy, and which the laws now secure to the clergy of the established church; but when I saw in a pamphlet, of which the Lord Bishop of Cloyne becomes the eulogist, a heavy and infamous charge, that the Catholic clergy consider tithes due to themselves *jure divino*, and encourage the laity to plunder the Protestant ministers for their own benefit, I gave a short account of their origin. In my addresses to the Whiteboys, the reader can see in what manner I enforced the payment of them. The Lord Bishop of Cloyne was unthankful to me; in return, I paid my complements to tithes and ecclesiastical establishments. I consider both as oppressive in Ireland, and elsewhere. If I do not speak with all that softness of churchmen, with which I certainly would have spoken upon another occasion; it is not certainly from any disrespect for the ecclesiastical profession. Severity regards such as have at different times abused their sacred characters from want of charity, or from want of disinterestedness, or both. The worthy are not to be confounded with the unworthy, no more than the chaff should be confounded with the pure and wholesome grain.

I wish the Lord Bishop of Cloyne had called me forth in more favourable circumstances, and in a general cause; but he calls me forth under the heaviest provocations, after having declared himself the apologist of a Theophilus, who exhaust the glossary of Billingsgate in a personal abuse:—'Whoever reads his Lordship's pamphlet, must consider the 'Catholic prelates as perjurers; the laity as enemies to the 'constitution, from a view to the revenues of the church, 'with the assistance of foreign power: and Mr. O'Leary, 'seditious with a train of agitating Friars and Romish mis-'sionaries.' If there be a plurality of worlds, I must have been born in the planet of Saturn, if I did not feel a certain warmth after such a provocation.

It cannot be expected that I will lose the little time I have to spare from my own important functions, in answering anonymous writers, or even authors who may prefix their names to pamphlets. The only person that I shall take the trouble of answering, is the Lord Bishop of Cloyne.

APPENDIX.

Reverend Mr. O'Leary's Address to the Common People of Ireland, particularly to such of them as are called Whiteboys.

BRETHREN AND COUNTRYMEN,

I ADDRESSED you before in the time of open war, when the enemies of your King and Country were within view of our coasts. Your prudent and peaceable conduct, at that critical time, answered the expectations of your instructors, and procured you the countenance and approbation of your rulers; the defenceless cottager was protected by the honesty of his neighbour; order and tranquillity reigned all over the land: each member of the community was secure in his respective rights and property: and whilst the plains of America were dyed with blood, and England was convulsed by the insurrections of the lower classes, who were either cut off by the army, or atoned on the gallows for the violation of the laws, you felt the happy effects of a quiet and orderly conduct.

Nature and religion, my brethren, recommend this peaceable and orderly conduct to man: to a peaceable and orderly conduct, nature annexes our happiness, and religion enjoins it as a duty. We are born with inclinations for order and peace, and we have the happiness to live under the wise laws of a Gospel, whose counsels and precepts, whose threats and promises, inspire the union of the hearts, and to do to others as we would wish to be done by.

Whence then those disturbances which of late have been occasioned by some of you in the diocese of Cloyne, and which now begin to reach to the diocese of Cork? You will tell me, that your grievances are the cause: I doubt it not my brethren; but still, under our grievances are we to forget that we are Christians? Under our grievances, are we to forget that the Providence of God has made an unequal distribution of the goods of this life, reserving a perfect equality for the next? Under our grievances, are we to forget that when our distresses are not the effects of our crimes, or imprudence, resignation to the will of heaven becomes an indispensable duty? Are we to forget that the way of the Cross is the road to the Crown; and that although religion does not condemn these distinctions of rank, fortunes, and authority established by Providence, for the subordination of subjects, and the tranquillity of States, yet there are more promises made in the Scriptures, in favour of those who suffer, than in favour of those who live in ease and opulence. And although the gates of salvation are open to the rich who make good use of their wealth, as they are to the poor who suffer with patience, yet the Scripture declares that they are narrower for the former than for the latter. In this life there must be grievances which no human wisdom can redress: the inconveniences arising from them are counterbalanced by the expectation of a better, promised by the Divine Author of our religion, who has set us the example of patience and suffering. The soldier, led on by his General, encounters death with intrepidity in hopes of victory, which soon after vanishes as smoke. And shall a Christian, called to an immortal crown, refuse to follow his king, who rears up the banners of the cross, and cries out, *Take up your cross and follow me in the paths of eternal life?* To a worldling plunged in the luxuries of life, such an address will appear insipid; but on you who are not lost to the feelings of religion, it will have a different effect. Perhaps when he comes to that part of it in which mention is made of crosses and sufferings, he will lay it aside, and say, Mr. O'Leary should write to those people in another style, and threaten them with curses, excommunications, halters, and gibbets. No, my brethren, curses and excommunications lose their effect, when lavished with too much profusion:

truth must not be made odious by the harsh manner in which it is conveyed: the nature of man is such, that he is gained upon by example and sweetness, more than by rudeness and severity: he is apt to hate the hand that is raised up to strike him, though it be for his correction; but he loves the hand that is stretched out to cure him. Sweetness, tenderness, and charity should form the principle character of a clergyman, and become the predominant spirit of his functions—they were not lions, but lambs, which our Saviour sent to preach his Gospel: it is to their patience, their mildness, their prayers and sufferings, that we are indebted for the conversion of the world, and the propagation of our Ministry. And I should be very sorry that you would derive no benefit from my instructions but a string of curses, which perhaps you would get by heart from no other view than to vent them upon your children in a fit of anger or resentment. As to halters and gibbets, the best way to restrain the hand, is to change the heart, which, when regulated by the Gospel law, will sacrifice the hand sooner than give offence.

However, my brethren, it is not in the nature of man to suffer under grievances which he can lawfully remove; it is when the remedy fails, or cannot be lawfully had, that patience becomes our only and most salutary resource, and I appeal to such of you as have been guilty of any outrages, whether the steps you have taken to redress your grievances be either conformable to the laws of God or nature, or whether they can ever answer any other purpose than that of drawing on ourselves the vengeance of the law. Is it an effectual mode of redressing our grievances to crop the ears of your neighbour's horse, or to destroy a rick of corn, the only resource of a poor industrious farmer who has no other means to pay his rent, and who, thrust into prison by a merciless landlord, will be for entire years, perhaps for life, viewing on the walls of a gloomy prison, the cruel marks of your barbarity? Whence arose the savage custom of houghing the most harmless and useful of animals, the horse, the cow? We read of nations not enlightened by the Christian religion, yet figure to themselves a supreme Being, the fountain of tenderness and mercy. These people think it a sin to deprive any crea-

ture of that life which the Supreme Being has given it, and consequently never eat fish or flesh. To guard against the love of pleasure, and to check the desires which may arise from the sight of any object, some of them pluck out their eyes, alleging that if they have shut two doors against their passions, they have opened a thousand doors to wisdom by qualifying themselves for the undistracted contemplation of Heavenly things. The Gospel does not require such severity from you. But I appeal to yourselves if these Pagans will not rise up in judgment against the Christians who are guilty of acts of cruelty? What, my brethren, have you forgotten the commandments of God, who takes your neighbour's ox and horse under his protection? For when he forbids us to covet them, he commands us not to injure them. You will tell me that if you have cropped two or three horses and burnt some ricks of corn, the injury has been done only to Parish Proctors, those leeches whom you consider as your greatest oppressors, who every season do you infinitely more harm: but this is a weak plea in the eyes of God, who commands us to love our enemies, and to do good to those who do us harm: who, after securing man's life and reputation by the fifth commandment, that says, *thou shalt not kill;* and his honour and domestic tranquillity, by the sixth, which says, *thou shalt not commit adultery*, becomes himself the watchful guardian of his temporal substance; by the seventh, which says, *thou shalt not steal*, and stifles in the heart every desire of fraud and injustice by the ninth. The commandment being general extends to all: hence he screens the poor from the oppression of the rich: forbids the poor under pretence of poverty to waste or plunder the property of the rich, and establishes the general and permanent peace of society on the love of our enemies, and that maxim of the law of nature, *not to do to others what we would not wish to be done to us;* much less will the quality of a Proctor excuse you in the eyes of the law, which punishes the crime without any regard to the quality of the injuries or injured.

I am happy to find that these disturbances have ceased after a very short duration, and though mightily magnified at a distance, have been confined but to a few parishes in the

dioceses of Cloyne and Cork, and that but few misguided persons have been concerned in them. But I am sorry you have adopted a new plan, which however moderate, and though certainly founded on your poverty on one hand, and the oppressive manner of collecting the tithes on the other, is very improper, and may prove of the most fatal consequence to yourselves. The following caution, which however it may involve yourselves in trouble, if carried into execution, yet will convince the kingdom, that the few breaches of the peace which happened in this county, have not originated in a spirit of rebellion, as has been insiduously and scandalously insinuated. The following caution, I say, has been, within these few days, affixed to the gates of parish Churches and Chapels:

Copy—'You are hereby cautioned not to pay Ministers' Tithes, only in the following manner, viz. potatos, 4*s.* per acre, wheat and barley, 1*s.* 6*d.* per acre, oats and meadows, 1*s.* per acre—Roman Catholic Clergy to receive for marriages, 5*s.* for baptism, 1*s.* 6*d.* for anointing and visitation of the sick, 1*s.* for mass, 1*s.* for confession, 6*d.*: you are hereby warned not to pay Clerk money,* nor any other dues concerning marriages; be all sure not to go to any expenses at your confessing turns, but let them partake of your own fare.'

It is needless to remind you of what the Dublin Shopkeeper has already informed you of, that posting up notices is a misdemeanor punishable by law, and that your imprudence may hurry you unwarily into several branches of the clauses of the Whiteboy Act, that decree death against offences, which to you may not seem of such importance. You may in like manner be led into the snare by imagining that this act is not now in force; it is in full force until the month of June, in the year seventeen hundred and eighty-seven. Many and severe are the clauses of that act; and though an English writer says that they are better calculated for the meridian of Barbary, than for a Christian country,† yet the severer they are, the more you should be on your guard: consider the danger to which you are exposed from the lo-

* Those Clerks are such as attend on Priests.

† See Young's Tour in Ireland.

gic and eloquence of Crown Lawyers, the perjury of witnesses, or the prejudices of juries. I am informed that the one who is to swear against some of you who are now in gaol, is one of the greatest villains in the kingdom, and escaped the gallows some years ago.

But to return to the caution. Pray, my brethren, what right have you to curtail, of your own authority, the income of the Protestant Clergy? I shall not go over the same ground trodden already by the Dublin Shopkeeper, on this subject: he proves, that if the tithes became the property of the laity, they would raise their rents in proportion: or is it because that, from the earliest ages of the world, those who believed in the true God, have consecrated to him a part of the fruits of the earth, you will think it an heavier burthen to pay the same thing, because it was in conformity to the law of God, that the laws of Christian states have appointed it? You know that the rules of justice extend to all without exception, and that, to use the familiar phrase, every one should have his own, whether he be Protestant or Catholic, Turk or Christian. It is more your interest than you imagine that the Protestant Clergy of this country should be maintained in their rights: for many ages you have been defenceless, destitute of any protection against the power of your landlords, your clergy liable to transportation or death. The mild and tolerating spirit of the clergy of the established religion has been the only substitute for all other resources. They trained up from their early days the Protestant Nobility and Gentry in the principles of morality and virtue. If they preached against purgatory, they enforced charity: if they denied the real presence, they took special care to inform their flock, that whoever does injustice to any one, either in his property or reputation, is unworthy to approach the Communion. If they denied that the Pope is head of the church, they taught their congregation that no man is to be injured on account of his religion, and that Christianity knows no enemy. As by nature we are prone to vices of every kind, and that the earliest impressions are the strongest, had it not been for those principles which they instilled into the minds of their hearers, long be-

fore now your landed proprietors in this country would have treated you as Turks, who think it no scruple to violate the beds of the Jews, and warn the husbands that if they come into their houses whilst they are doing them this injustice, they will cut off their heads.

Is it then to gentlemen of this description, the children of the first families in the kingdom, the instructors of the most powerful part of the community, the most moral and edifying amongst them, the most charitable and humane, that a handful of poor men are to prescribe laws, tending to diminish the support of their offspring, destined to fill one day the most important offices in the State? What! a Rev. Arcdeacon Corker, a Rev. Archdeacon Tisdall, a Rev. Mr. Chetwood, a Rev. Mr. Weekes, a Rev. Mr. Meade, a Rev. Mr. Kenny, who spent his time and fortune amongst you, relieving your wants, and changing part of his house into an apothecary's shop to supply you with medicines, which yourselves could not purchase, must from an apprehension of violence quit his house, at the threshold of which appeared so many Lazarus's with their sores not licked by his dogs, but fomented or bathed with his own hands; not desiring to be fed with the crumbs that fell from his table, but replenished to satiate with his own fare! Many more of these Gentlemen could I mention, and I ask yourselves whether you would benefit the more by having their property curtailed? Still I know that you are oppressed and impoverished more than any set of the lower classes of people on earth. And by that notice you have posted up, it appears that it is far from your thoughts to overturn what is established by law, but lighten the bnrthen. It is not in the tithes themselves that the oppression lies, but in the manner of raising their value, and collecting them. The established clergy themselves, whose dignity and functions do not permit them to take on themselves the disagreeable office, and who, on the other hand, if they took your notes, which perhaps you would be unwilling or unable to pay when they would become due, would feel too much in being obliged to sue a set of poor people in a Court of Justice. The established Clergy themselves, I say, are perplexed: they are not inclined to oppress

you on one hand, and none can expect that they will part with their rights on the other. And as for your parts, you cannot be judges in your own cause. The supreme power of the state alone is competent to determine the mode of redress, which is too intricate a matter for me to determine. It is doubtless the interest of your landlords not to have a wretched and beggarly tenantry. It is in like manner their interest to support amongst their tenants a due subordination to their respective Pastors. For the generality of mankind, can have no other rule, but their instruction, whereby to regulate their moral conduct. The impressions of religion, and the dread of an invisible Judge, the conscious witness of our actions, are stronger than the terror of human laws, which are often eluded by privacy and several other ways; and when once we shake off the authority of religion, when opportunity offers, we are ready to shake off the authority of our masters. Present a memorial of whatever grievances you suffer to your respective landlords, who, I should hope, will transmit it to their friends in Parliament: if Parliament cannot strike out a plan, you have no remedy whatever but that patience, which I before recommended to you, and which softens the afflictions of sufferers. In a word, without the interposition of the supreme power of the state, you must either bear with patience the grievances of which you complain, or suffer an ignominious death, or seek for a better situation in remote countries, where there is more encouragement, and where thousands of your Protestant fellow-subjects, less oppressed than you are, have taken shelter.

As to the regulations you have made with regard to the dues of your own clergy, it is a standing maxim with all States where there are several religions, and but one established by law, not to grant any legal redress for non-payment of dues but to the clergy of the established religion, such as the clergy of the church of England here and in England, the Lutheran clergy in Sweden, and the Presbyterian clergy in Holland, Geneva, and elsewhere. Free toleration of religion, and the voluntary contributions of those of their own profession, are the only resources of the clergy who are not of the religion of the state: I consider it your duty, nay your

interest, to support them in a decent manner according to your abilities; and this support should appear to you the less burthensome, as there is no compulsion, which in general makes the receiver disagreeable to those who give when compelled, and deprive the giver of the merit of what he contributes, when he contributes more from compulsion than from duty and charity. On this head then, we can literally apply to the words of St. Paul, in his second Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. 9. *Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver.* Christ himself, who in every page of the Scriptures preached up the renunciation of ourselves, still declares that the labourer is worthy of his hire. And St. Paul, the patron of disinterestedness and mortification, declares, that those who serve the altar, should live by it, and that such as feed the flock, are entitled to a share of the milk. It is your own interest that your Pastors be maintained with decency; that in a country where Gentlemen of a different religion esteem the Catholic Clergy more for their outward appearance and conduct, than for their profession, your Pastors should appear with decency; and that in country parishes where even in the dead of the night, they are obliged to go seven or eight miles, and perhaps more, to relieve a dying person, they should have a horse, in order to be able to give you every assistance with the utmost expedition in these pressing moments, when (if ever) delays are the most dangerous.

Nor, my brethren, should you disregard my remarks on this subject, because I am a Clergyman: you know that for the space of fifteen years since my arrival in this country, weddings and baptisms are quite out of my line, yet I never ceased to exhort and instruct you to the utmost of my abilities.

My brethren, I earnestly entreat you to follow the advice of those who wish you well, who have your interest at heart, who foresee the danger that threatens you, and of which you are not sufficiently aware: you will find the advantage of peace and tranquillity; none can wish it with more sincerity, than your affectionate servant, A. O'LEARY.

Cork, Feb. 18, 1786.

Rev. Mr. O'Leary's Second Address to the Common People of Ireland, particularly to such of them as are called Whiteboys.

BRETHREN AND COUNTRYMEN,

FAR be it from me to oppose (were it in my power) the redress of your grievances; but, I repeat it, by your manner of redressing them, the remedy is worse than the disorder. I would rather pay my tithes, let them be ever so oppressive, than put my neck in the halter by disturbing the peace of society, and violating the laws of the realm, let them be ever so severe. No rulers on earth will permit any order of men to overturn established laws, by private authority. They will listen to the grievances of the subject, but they will reserve to themselves the mode of redress. They can neve make the people happy but by keeping them subject to authority, and by making this subjection as easy and reconcileable to them as the exigencies of the state will permit. The multitude is too fickle and inconstant for governing itself. It cannot be happy without subordination to order and authority; if it once strikes out of the path of obedience to the laws, there is an end of Government. Troubles, dissensions, civil wars, and impunity for the most atrocious crimes, must be the result. And in this state of convulsion, the man who complained of grievances before, under the ruling powers, will feel heavier grievances from his neighbour, who, unrestrained by law, will become his murderer or oppressor. If we were prisoners of war in an enemy's country, we are bound by the laws of God and nations to behave in a peaceable manner, much more so when we form members of the same society, governed by the same Sovereign and the same laws,

But what surprises me most with regard to the notice you have posted up, whereby you caution each Parishioner not to give but so much for Tithes, and so much to the Roman Catholic Clergy, is, that you bind yourselves by oath to abide by this regulation. Had you en-

tered into a resolution not to pay but four shillings tithes for every acre of potatos, &c. a court of justice would determine whether you were right or wrong. And in case you were cast at law, as in all appearance you would be, the payment of the tithes, and the costs of the suit, would be the only disadvantage you would labour under. But here, by one oath, you fall into a double snare: You perplex and entangle your consciences on one hand, and on the other you put yourselves in the power of the law.

Upon a former occasion I explained to you the nature of oaths, and the horror of perjury. And although you have not perjured yourselves in swearing to your own resolutions, as it was not to a lie you swore, yet permit me to tell you, that your oath was rash, and so far a profanation of the most sacred name of God. It is with the greatest reluctance a man should swear at all, even in a just cause, and from conviction. We read in some Jewish authors, that the awful name of the Divinity was uttered but once a year by the High Priest, at the solemn Benediction, after purifying himself, and washing his hands in the blood of the victim that was offered up, before he entered the sanctuary. The veneration also of the Heathens for their false Gods, was such, that in the beginning no oaths were customary, from a reverence to the Deity. Princes ratified the most solemn treaties by joining hands: and in the ages of heroism, the warrior thought himself sufficiently engaged to his General by looking at the military standard erected upon an eminence, with the image of the tutelary God painted on the banners. Such was the veneration of all nations for the awful name of the Deity, and the sanctity of that maxim of holy writ, that we are *not to trifle with holy things*. Compare your conduct with that of the primitive inhabitants of the world, you who should be struck with a greater awe as having a more perfect knowledge of the true God, and yet make it a part of your Sunday's devotion to hand the book to each other in order to swear to what must be destructive to yourselves, and injurious to the rights of others—*you will swear to the Lord your God*, says the Scripture, *in truth, in judgment, and in righteousness, or justice.* It is not sufficient for the lawfulness of an oath, that whatever we swear to be true. It

requires moreover that the oath be attended with judgment, that is to say, that the object of it be not rash; there must be necessity and prudence. There must be also justice, otherwise the name of God is profaned, and the oath is not binding. When Herod swore that he would give his daughter whatever she would ask him, he was guilty of murder in giving her the head of John the Baptist, and of profanation in calling on God as the witness and sanction of his cruelty. You swear that you will pay but four shillings for an acre of potatos, &c.

When St. Augustine lays down as a maxim that the laws of every state regulate the property of the subject, and that whatever we possess must be in consequence of the determination of the law; when St. Paul commands us to pay honour to whom honour, and tribute to whom tribute is due, can the most learned Casuist determine that you are bound to pay no more than the precise sum of four shillings for an acre? Your oath then is the same thing as if you swore in the following manner: *I swear by this book that I will do such a thing, whether it be right or wrong.* Is such an oath just? In like manner let me suppose that after this oath, you may be sued at law for the tithes, and for non-payment be cast into prison, or have your little property distrained. What will be the consequence? You must either break your oath, or remain in prison, or have your poor families ruined. Thus your oath is the same as if it were as follows: *I swear by this book, that I will either break this oath, or rot in prison, or ruin my family.* Is there judgment, is there prudence in this? Add to this, that such persons as tender such oaths are in the power of the law, and will be treated with the utmost rigour. And on this occasion, I conjure the Gentlemen of this country who may read this letter, and be next Assizes on your Jury, to distinguish the wanton compellers of such oaths, and the persons who take or administer them from fear or compulsion. I say, take or administer them; for, take and administer in the sense I allude to, are synonimous in the eyes of humanity and justice, when the motive, I mean for fear of grievous outrage to their persons or property, compels them to take the oath, or administer to others. And

when I make this request, you see, my brethren, how much I have your interest at heart, and with what sincerity I wish to prevent the effusion of your blood.

The same motives induced a Protestant Gentleman, an acquaintance of mine, to address six letters to you, in a style adapted to your understanding, under the signature of *a Dublin Shopkeeper*. He had no motive whatever but your welfare, as his property is not in the county. His humanity and benevolence alone induced him to point out the danger to which you were exposed, the imaginary and groundless prospects you figured to yourselves, and which you will soon see vanish as smoke: the various delusions to which the unthinking multitude are liable to fall victims, and the caution you should take against those misfortunes in which a conduct similar to yours has involved so many others, several of whom were really innocent. To deprive his letters of the effect they should have on you, you were made to believe that they were written by some Clergyman, interested in the preservation of tithes, or if a Roman Catholic, in the collection of his dues. I declare upon my conscience, that they were written by a Protestant Layman, and that I myself did not know the author, until after the publication of the first letter. They deserve your attention the more as they come from such a disinterested hand, and as I am equally unconcerned in these matters, only as far as they regard your own safety, and the peace of the public.

I hope that this Address will deserve your attention, as it gives the sanction of religion to the maxims of prudence, laid down in that Gentleman's writings. I am confident that many of you have been misled by your ignorance of the laws, and that as these disturbances originated in the dues of the clergy, you did not forsee the consequences to yourselves. That Gentleman's letters deserve your most serious attention, as he explains all the laws which hang over you. On the other hand, it is a standing maxim, that it is better to prevent crimes than to punish them. It would be an act of humanity in the Associations, composed of Noblemen and Gentlemen, for the suppression of tumults in the

county of Cork, to get numbers of that Gentleman's letters dispersed gratis through the country. It is the opinion of a great and humane writer,* that every Member of Society should know when he is criminal, and when innocent. This cannot be done without a knowledge of the laws which affect the lives and liberties of the subjects. This knowledge is never sufficiently communicated in this kingdom to the multitude at large, few of whom can purchase the ordinary vehicles of information, the Acts; and even Newspapers, are prohibited from even inserting abstracts under the penalty of a prosecution from the King's Printer. In foreign countries when new laws, affecting the lives of the people, are enacted, they are posted up on the gates of the Churches in all the Parishes, and their non-promulgation is pleaded in justification of the fact. This before-mentioned conduct corresponds with Beccaria's wishes, who says, that every citizen should have the code of laws which affect his life; and that the conduct of Censors and Magistrates who punish the ignorant, is a kind of tyranny which surrounds the confines of political liberty. If the laws are made for the people, they should know them, and laws which affect the lives of the multitude, should not be confined to the Lawyer's library. I am confident that not one out of ten thousand of the country people, knows one clause of the Whiteboy Act. This is the time to make it as public as possible in a county hitherto the most peaceable in the kingdom. But to return from this digression to you, my brethren, if you have any room to claim of the extortions of any of your Clergy, why have you not made application to your Bishops previous to those tumultuary meetings? Would Lord Dunboyne, as distinguished for his tenderness, his charity, the sweetness and amiableness of his manners, as he is by his high birth and exalted station; or would the pious and edifying Doctor M'Kenna permit the oppression of the poor under pretence of religion? They, who are more inclined to relieve your wants than to add

* Beccaria.

to them? There is some exaggeration in your written notice, insinuating that your Pastors require more than you can afford, and that some of them are more attentive to your substance than your souls. Sure, my brethren, a Roman Catholic Clergyman, who in times of prosecution would be bound not to abandon you, but to share your sufferings, and undergo every hardship for the sake of your salvation; bound to appear as the public deputy of the people, at the foot of the altar, erected to a God, who died naked on the cross, and to wean your affections from the perishable goods and fleeting pleasures of this short and distracted life, to fix them on Heavenly goods; sure, no Roman Catholic Clergyman would make a traffic of the Sacraments, in extorting from an unhappy object, who has but fourpence a day to support a wife and a number of children, with a handful of vegetables and a draught of water. We are rather bound to sell the sacred vases of the temple, if we had any to dispose of, sooner than slay the victim, already fleeced by oppressive rack-rents. It cannot be conceived that a Roman Catholic Clergyman, who pays the least regard to the dignity and decency of his character, would sit down in a barn or cabin, at the expense of the labouring man, and by intemperance, efface in the evening those impressions of piety which he imparted to him in the morning. No, there is no such thing. But there is the mistake you have committed in the oath already mentioned. You have bound by the oath the opulent farmer, who is able and willing to give to your Pastors wherewithal to support them, and to afford yourselves some assistance in your wants. You have bound him in like manner not to give any more than a crown, &c. and this is an injustice under the solemnity of an oath. For, whatever a poor man may do with a trifle scarce competent to support himself, he has no right to controul the pockets of, or to prescribe laws to the rich. If there had been scandalous extortions of the kind, you should have preferred complaints to the Bishops, and these venerable Prelates would have ordered their Clergy to cry out from their Altars, with the Prophet Jonas, *if it be on my account that this storm is raised throw me overboard.*

The oppression of the poor, and the love of sordid gain, are inconsistent with the character of persons whose ministry is the condemnation of avarice, the contempt of riches, and the recommendation of charity. They are not disposed to bruise the reed already broken, nor to change the tender and inviting voice of fathers and pastors into the harsh language of griping tax-gatherers. Has not Mr. O'Kelly, have not others declared from the altars, that they require no more from you than what you are willing to give? Let not then the sacred ministry be a pretext for the public disturbances, which in the end must prove destructive to yourselves. Let your grievances be redressed by the wisdom and humanity of your superiors in Church and State. Let public tranquillity be restored, and let yourselves enjoy the fruits and sweets of a peaceable conduct and innocent conscience, which alone can recommend you to, and procure you the protection of God and your rulers. No person can wish you every happiness more than your affectionate servant,

A. O'LEARY.

Cork, Feb. 21, 1786.

Rev. Mr. O'Leary's Third Address to the Whiteboys, particularly those of the County of Cork.

COUNTRYMEN,

To such of you as still persist in setting the laws of your country at defiance, in opposition to the dictates of prudence, which suggests to man not to hazard rashly his life, nor the interest of his family, but rather to bear patiently with a slighter inconvenience to avoid a greater; to such of you as still pursue a line of conduct (misconduct I should have said) so destructive to yourselves, and subversive of peace and good order, I address myself at this critical juncture. For I shall not confound those who first engaged in your cause, either from error or licentiousness, and are now reclaimed to their duty, with those who still march on in a road which, from sad experience, they will find to end in a precipice. At

the first breaking out of these unhappy disturbances, you got every caution which religion, reason, and humanity could prompt men of compassion and feelings to give a multitude easily misled, and, according to the common course of human affairs, incapable of drawing the delicate line to which common sense points out, and of which it says, *thus far you shall go and no farther.* The dangers to which you were exposed from a disorderly conduct, the imaginary and groundless prospects you figured to yourselves, and which you now behold vanishing as smoke, the various delusions to which the unthinking multitude are liable to fall victims, the precaution you should take against the misfortune in which a conduct similar to yours had involved so many before. Every thing, in short, was explained to you. The maxims of human prudence were strengthened, and enforced by the great principles of religion: and we had every room to expect, that in case religion had lost its influence over you as christians, at least your own preservation, as men, founded upon the first principles of nature, would induce you to expose your bodies to the rod of justice, or to the executioner's hand. When you imagined yourselves secure in your numbers, an anticipated list was made out of so many Whiteboys whipped, so many shot by the army, so many Whiteboys' widows and orphans reduced to beggary, from the misconduct of their former husbands and fathers. There was no inspiration requisite, in order to foretel such future events: foresight and sense uttered a prophesy which you see now fulfilled, and the accomplishment whereof you can read on the mangled backs of the companions of your former excursions. If you are wise then, return peaceably and without delay to your occupation and duty, and do not swell the catalogue of suffering offenders: it is the advice of one who has your welfare at heart; who, whilst he reprobates your disorders, pities your weakness, and who, in acknowledging the justice of the punishment inflicted for the crime, commiserates the man in the criminal.

But what will my pity avail, if you do not pity yourselves? How, or by what arguments to reclaim you, I am at a loss. I shall however pay this last tribute to humani-

ty, and follow the advice of the Apostle who commands Ministers of the Gospel *to rebuke, reprove, exhort* the sinner. *To be instant in season, and out of season.* If my endeavours should chance *to be out of season* with regard to the obstinate, yet they may be in season with regard to those whom I would fain preserve from the contagion of your pernicious example. I reclaimed some of your associates before, who now feel the comfort of having returned to the path of peace and good order. Happy for you, though late, if you copied after them. To attempt to reclaim you by the power and influence of religion would, I am afraid, be an useless task. You have thrown off its restraint. And however orderly a well bred Deist who does not feel distress, but laughs at religion, may conduct himself through life until the scene of delusion is closed, and death introduces him to the Judge, who says, Woe to you who laugh, &c. When the common people in any state throw off the restraint of religion, or become fanatics, they may like lions unchained, who, if not opposed by force or stratagem, will devour their defenceless prey. Of this we have unhappy proofs in the disturbances which have disgraced this province. When you minded your religion, grace and order reigned over the land. The weary cottager, after his labour and rural meal, slept secure, and acquired fresh strength for the toils of the ensuing day; and if the neighbour was injured in his property by stealth and fraud, the dread of profaning the Sacraments was attended with restitution, and the purpose of amendment. But when, to the astonishment and scandal of the public, religion became a sport; when the houses of worship were profaned by the tumultuary meetings, beginning their devotions with the solemnity of combination oaths, without inquiring whether they were lawful or sacrilegious; when the flocks became deaf to the instructions of the pastors, dictating instead of obeying, and did with their own hands, what the most infamous Priest-catchers refrained from doing in times of persecution, I mean the nailing up of Chapels, and excluding from the house of God such as intended to offer up their prayers on that day appointed by all denominations of Christians for

the worship of the Supreme Being, and held so sacred, that on that day the very administration of civil justice is suspended; when without any intention to exchange the creed for another, but rather get rid of both, nor any intention to reform the morals, but rather to obtain impunity for licentiousness, you flocked to the Protestant churches, as the temples in former times were resorted to by those malefactors who intended to make of the house of God a rampart againt the pursuit of violated justice; when this irreligious farce was attended with the notes of the flute, and the blasts of the bagpipe playing from one house of worship into another, a set of men combined against the clergy of both, threatening with destruction the respectable Catholics who refused to attend the procession of disorder in tumult.

In short, when religion lost its hold of people accustomed to revere and respect it, then the most peaceable county of the kingdom became a scene of anarchy, disorder, and confusion, and spread the contagion far and wide; a brutal and indiscriminate vengeance was wreaked upon man and beast: and the excesses of the mad rabble who acknowledged Lord George Gordon for their President in the year eighty, have been in some measure copied by the followers of Captain Right in the year eighty-six; the former burnt houses, and committed singing birds to the flames; the latter cropped horses, and burnt ricks of corn.—*O foolish Galatians?* says St. Paul, *what hath bewitched you?*

If you complained of grievances, was redress to be obtained by profanation, and inhuman and barbarous steps, which tend to defeat the very end you propose to yourselves, and to make you rather objects of detestation than pity? When you complained of the conduct of some of your own clergymen, as overbearing and rigorous; to remove every plea for disorder and discontent, your prelates assembled, and after declaring that a small stipend, the reasonableness of which they left to the decision of the public, was requisite for the support of your pastors; they enjoined them at the same time not to enforce a rigorous exaction of their

dues, but to shew, upon all occasions, that spirit of mildness, lenity, and disinterestedness, so becoming their sacred character. What more could they have done? You, on the other hand, not only bound yourselves by oath to withhold your usual support, but controul the opulent and well-disposed, who were willing and able to make up for what yourselves were unwilling and unable to give. Thus, under pretence of redressing grievances, you became the oppressors of your spiritual guides, and as to your causes of complaint from proctors and tithe-farmers, instead of waiting for that relief which the humanity and wisdom of the Parliament may in time and place suggest, you have arrogated to yourselves a power bordering upon life and death, by burying them up to their chins in graves, lined with briars and other materials of torture, leaving their life or destruction to the bare chance of being found or not found, by some passenger. Great God! could you be so divested of feeling as to inflict such a punishment, or so devoid of common sense as to imagine that such a conduct was the best method of deserving the attention and compassion of your rulers? The public considered these horrid barbarities as the effects of a temporary madness, which cool reason and the severity of the law would effectually cure. But what must not be their indignation and astonishment, if, after the steps which Government has taken, they see you not only relapse into your former frenzy, but work yourselves up to the highest pitch of madness!

After reforming the clergy, you now proceed to reform the state. By your new regulations, no labouring man is to go to another parish to save the harvest. This certainly shews your humanity and wisdom, on the eve of the severe winter, where every hand should be employed to secure the bounties of nature—and this I call a *regulation of beggary and imprisonment.* For the landlord will have his rent or your bodies, and if you refuse to work you must beg; and the public will give no alms to persons who become idlers from wilful obstinacy.

You write threatening letters to the Civil Magistrate, ordering him, under the severest penalties, to interfere no more in your proceedings, and are come to resolves about the

hearth-money, which you intend to regulate by your own standard; and this regulation about magistrates and hearth-money, as more immediately affecting Majesty, is a regulation bordering upon treason or rebellion, and appropriating to yourselves a part of the revenues of the crown. To crown the work, you posted up a notice, or you wrote a menacing letter to a most respectable Protestant clergyman, ordering him not to meddle with an old church in his parish, the materials of which are requisite to defray the expenses incurred by building a new one, but to leave it to you for a chapel. And this regulation, to me, is a regulation of surprise and astonishment. What a surprising transition from profanation to devotion, from one extreme to another! Some time before you nailed up the chapels. and would not permit your clergy to officiate therein. Now your own chapels will not suffice without having the church: not long since you carried the chapel to church; now you will have the church come back to the chapel. This is a strange fit of devotion in a set of men who, not long ago, in derision of priesthood, gave but an Irish crown to the pastor, at a wedding, and collected eighteen shillings for the piper: but pray, if you obtain the church, who will be your chaplain? For I am sure no Roman Catholic clergyman will be so mad as to obtrude into a church, of the established religion, under the banners of sedition. You must then ordain a chaplain yourselves; and every person who attempts a reformation in the church and state, without an ordinary mission, commonly pleads a mission from Heaven. Captain Right may assume the power of ordination, as the German cobbler, who attempted the reformation of religion, pretended to impart the gift of prophecy to his disciples, by making them drink a pot of beer, and giving them on the head a stroke of a poker.

However, as this extraordinary message, purporting to give up a Protestant church to be changed into a chapel, is become the general subject of conversation, it is incumbent on me to make my remarks on it. I have read so many anecdotes of plots and roguish schemes, of which simpletons were the tools, and knaves the contrivers, that I am very cautious. It is supposed that when you meet in your lurking

holes, you all agree in the same measure, and that every deliberation is the act of the whole corps, otherwise you would soon disperse. If then this message be really an act of your meeting, some artful incendiary, capable of working upon your intellects, stupified by watching and intoxication, has crept in among you, either to cause some confusion in the state, from motives best known (if not to himself) certainly to his employer, or from an expectation of obtaining a reward for swearing away your lives at the next assizes. For there is not the least shadow of probability, that a set of night-strollers, cropping cattle and burning corn, after nailing up chapels and humbling their clergy, would expose themselves to martyrdom in forcing a Protestant clergyman to give up a church, to indulge a devotion. Moreover, you know that when a new place of worship is to be erected, the Parish Priest is always consulted; for where there is no Mass, there is an end of the chapel. You know full well that no Priest would attend you in such a fit of frantic devotion, if you did not force him to ride bare-backed, Proctor-like, on Captain Right's grey horse, with the furze saddle under him, and the horn sounding before him. Give up then every thought of changing the church into a chapel, for you will never get any Priest to attend you there, without you drive him before you mounted, as I mentioned; and I am sure that the most ambitious of the clergy would not ride the Pope's mule in such an equipage. The message then, if it comes from you, is of a piece with the rest of your proceedings, as far as they are barely confined to nonsense; and if the churches and chapels were the anti-chambers of Heaven, they could never procure admittance into its inner apartments, whilst you lead a loose and licentious life, destroying your neighbour's property, and disturbing the peace of society. However, if you want to see the inside of that church, you shall be gratified on the following condition:— Appoint what Sunday you think fit, and that at soonest, and I shall go and meet you there, not to say mass, but to give you an exhortation, or a sermon, which ever you like. Colonel Mannix, or any of the neighbouring Magistrates will, I am confident, not refuse to attend; after the exhortation of which you certainly stand in need, the Magistrate will

explain the law to you, listen to your complaints, and if you make a solemn promise, which you can without any remorse, confirm with an oath, to return peaceably to your duty, and to disturb no longer the community, he will transmit your complaints to your Representatives in Parliament. A similar affair happened already, and has been attended with success, for the people, on listening to reason, returned to the path of moderation and good conduct: all this is to be done with the consent of the gentleman to whom the old church belongs, for you know that it is not civil to force into another man's house. The pastor of that church is a stedfast Protestant, and I am a stedfast Roman Catholic, believing seven sacraments, and every article that has been explained to you in your early days in your catechism. Yet we are both united in the same cause of charity and benevolence with several other gentlemen of different persuasions, as Members of the Committee for the Relief of Insolvent Debtors.

Our controversies turn upon the ways and means of keeping order and cleanliness in the gaols, of procuring the captive debtors a weekly allowance, of compounding with their creditors, and restoring them to their poor families. The very Magistrates who you threaten are subscribers to this institution: on the list of the relieved captives are numbers of your own namesakes and relations. This digression I make in order to remind you of your ingratitude and delusion in meddling with the clergy of the established religion, many of whom deserve so well of the poor; but that gentleman in particular, the martyr of charity, who bestows on them the portion of time and substance which he can spare from his functions and family. The proposal of meeting I make from my heart; the subject of my sermon shall be the obligations which nature and religion impose on man to live peaceably and honestly, both as a Christian and a member of civil society, and my text shall be these words of St. Paul, *I exhort therefore that prayer and supplication be made for kings, and for all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all Godliness and honesty.* 1 *Tim. c.* 2. May you conform your lives to the text! Amen. But to return to the notice, or message:

It is most likely that some one who would not much scruple to tell a lie at the expense of your lives, has written the letter in your name, or posted up the notice, to make you more odious than you are, (though you are odious enough already,) and to hasten the vengeance of the laws which await you, by quickening the fears of the public. Every robbery and plunder will be laid to your charge, several seditious letters will be written in your names, and divine justice will permit that even the malice of others will hasten to your ruin. And however I hate your proceedings, I really pity your madness in putting it in their power; and the more so, as, according to St. Augustine, no wretch is more to be pitied than the wretch who does not pity himself. One should think, that more than a twelvemonth's apprenticeship to licentiousness, besides the losses you have sustained, would have tired you in the road of iniquity; and little did we expect to hear any more of cropping horses and burning corn, much less depriving the cottager of the use of his spade amidst the invitations of a copious harvest. Little did we expect to hear of attempts to deprive the landlords of their rent, to encroach upon the authority of Parliament, and to invade the rights of the Crown, by arrogating to yourselves the power of regulating the taxes of the state, after two assizes, and the lenity, impartiality and wisdom which Government has shewn upon the occasion; for what greater proofs of them could Government have given, than when the energy of the laws was to be supported by the military power, it appointed a General who unites humanity with valour, who condescended to appear in your complaints, prevailed on several gentlemen concerned in tithes to reduce to the most reasonable standard; copied after that illustrious Roman, who, when the common people had thrown off the yoke of subordination, kept the sword in the sheath, and held out the olive branch, preferring in the first stage of the political distemper, lenient to violent remedies: a General, in fine, who, on hearing well-grounded complaints, would forget the warrior in the advocate of the distressed, if the complainers ceased to be licentious.

In the delicate circumstances which affected your lives, Government appointed a judge, endowed with extensive

knowledge, penetration, and wisdom, which qualify him so eminently for holding the scale in which the lives, the fortune, and the honour of men are to be weighed; with integrity, proof against the attacks of power and interest, with humanity and moderation, which without loosening the veil wherewith justice is painted hoodwinked, can raise its border to cast a glance of pity on the unfortunate: such were the two illustrious personages in whose hands Government lodged the sword of military power and justice, to suppress the disorders to which you have given rise. I mean Lord Luttrell and Lord Chief Baron Yelverton. Wisdom and impartiality made a choice which humanity applauded; but a longer continuance of your madness and folly must baffle their united efforts, to your own inevitable destruction.

The honour of the country, the preservation of public order, the protection of the defenceless cottager, and the prevention of further disorders, will compel Generals to mark the progress of their march with your blood, and judges to stretch the laws to their utmost. Equally cruel to yourselves and unmerciful to others, if you have any grievances to complain of, you block up every road to redress, by the very steps whereby you intend to obtain it.

In a large country, and I may almost say a province, without arts or manufactures, where, in some places, in a range of fifty or sixty miles, scarce a wheel or reel can be met with for want of flax or wool to employ the house-wife, and where the very treasures of the ocean are become useless for want of the means to improve the advantages of nature: in a place so circumstanced, where the poor cottager must with five-pence a day support himself, a wife, and five or six children, more or less, and contribute his share to the support of the State, you attempt to deprive poor industrious men of the liberty of earning the means of subsistance. Some of you can remember the great frost, and such of you as were not born at the time must know, from the tradition of your fathers, that Heaven visited the land with a famine, whose ravages amongst the common people were such, that for want of food, the living had scarce strength enough to bury the dead. Now Heaven is kind in granting you an extraordinary continuance of fair weather,

and a plentiful harvest, and the favours of Heaven you reject. Instead of practising the lesson which nature itself gives you in the example of the ant, the bee, and several classes of irrational beings, an example which Solomon recommends to your imitation in the following words: *Go to the ant, thou sluggard, consider her ways and be wise; which having no guide, overseer, or ruler, provideth her meat in the summer, and gathereth her food in the harvest.* Instead of improving the fair weather to the best advantage in new thatching your cabins, in minding your business, and laying in a stock for the support of yourselves and families against the ensuing winter, you exhaust your health in those nightly excursions, the fruits of which must be the loss of life or liberty, or criminal weariness which disables you from working the following day. Under the pretence of redressing grievances, you confine the labourer who has no work at home, who at stated times goes to earn his wages in other parishes, and whose assistance is requisite for saving the harvest. You confine him to his cottage, where he has nothing to behold but a wife and children perishing with hunger, and his spade and shovel decaying with rust, because by the regulations of the Rightboys, he dares not to handle them in the parishes where he could get employment. Thus you oppress the poor; you distress the farmer, who at certain times wants an extraordinary number of hands; you will fill the gaols with insolvent debtors; and you begin to sow the seeds of scarcity and famine, which yourselves must inevitably feel, as well as the innocent, which suffer but too often for the guilt of others. If this be your mode of redressing grievances, the remedy is worse than the disease; and if no other crime could be laid to your charge but this regulation only, this alone would expose you to the detestation of every honest man.

I appeal to yourselves, whether the unhappy persons who lost their lives by attempting a rescue, and thus impeding the course of justice, would not have done better to mind their business, than to cut off by a sudden death, and leave their widows and orphans without support? To yourselves I appeal, whether such of your associates as have already undergone the just punishment of the law, or such as are

now confined in order to take their trial at the next assizes, and who, besides their personal disgrace and danger, must feel for their families, destitute of their support, and distressing themselves to support them in their confinement? I appeal to yourselves, whether these persons would not have done better to mind their labour, and partake in common with their little families of the fruits of their honest industry, than to be, as they now are, the unpitied objects of wretchedness, labouring under present anguish, and haunted with the terror of future punishment, representing to themselves the sword of justice hanging over their heads, and uncertain of their future destiny. Would you really wish to be in their situation? Answer me.—I am sure you would not. If then you intend to avoid their fate, avoid their example, and learn a little wisdom from the folly of others, or rather avoid the punishment by avoiding the guilt.

Do you really believe, my brethren, (I call you brethren, because I begin to soften from pity for the misfortunes you have already brought on others, and which you will inevitably bring on yourselves, for methinks I already hear the cries of your widows, or forlorn mothers, calling to me for alms to help them to buy your coffins,) do you really believe that an obstinate perseverance in disorder, a repetition of conflagrations and outrages, and a gradual rise from one abuse to another, are the best means of disposing your rulers to lenity, and to a consideration of the causes of your complaints? No, they only tend to give a keener edge to the sword of justice. You should rather dread, lest constant provocations on your part, and every effort to reclaim you to your duty, rendered fruitless by an obstinate resistance, may induce the legislature to make what is called a misdemeanor, *capital felony*, and that the same offences which in your associates have been punished with whipping or imprisonment only, may doom yourselves to the halter. What if you were declared public enemies to the State, and shot without further ceremony wherever you would be met with after nightfall? This is what you have to fear, and nothing to hope while you remain turbulent.

No rulers on earth will permit any order of men to overturn established laws, whilst they have power to maintain their authority. Much less will the rulers of this kingdom change one tittle of the laws, on occasion of any violence committed by a set of men who could be mowed down as so many withered weeds, by one single regiment. They will listen to the complaints of the subject when preferred to them in a decent, humble, and becoming manner, and through a proper channel. But they will reserve to themselves the mode of redress, as well as the time for granting or refusing it. The multitude is too fickle and inconstant for governing itself. If it once strikes out of the path of subordination, tumults, dissensions, and the most atrocious crimes must be the result; and in this state of convulsion, the man who complained of grievances before, under the ruling powers, will feel heavier grievances from his neighbour, who, unrestrained by law, will become his murderer or oppressor. Your conduct justifies my remark; the man who earned his four-pence or five-pence a day, slept secure under the protection of the law, and in the neighbourhood of the magistrate. Now, by the Whiteboy rules, he must starve in his cottage for want of liberty to earn his bread in a distant parish, or ride the grey horse on a furze saddle, or to be buried to his chin in a torturing grave. How to conclude this letter I am at a loss: if you have any regard for your lives, for your wives, for your children, for your fathers, or for your mothers, I conjure you in the name of God, to desist without any further delay. Lord Luttrell, who, to his eternal honour, has inquired into your complaints, is in possession of whatever is to be laid before the State of the nation, whose decision you should wait for, with that submission becoming subjects, and that prudence which should hinder you as men from running to your final destruction. Your cause could not be in worse hands than your own: therefore throw yourselves on the mercy of your rulers, and do not force them to forget, in the multitude of your offences, whatever may be the cause of your complaints. This plain, simple, and candid advice is now your last resource: if you reject it, you are undone; for you will not only have the laws and the army let loose on you, but all the nobility and gentry; all the wise, peaceable, and virtuous subjects, will consider you as public enemies, whose

destruction is requisite for their own preservation. And as you are ignorant of the danger which threatens you, I request in your behalf, as a favour of the Printers throughout the kingdom, to copy this letter into their respective papers, and of the friends of humanity to make it as public as possible, by dispersing it amongst you. That it have on you the desired effect, is the wish of

Your's, &c.

A. O'LEARY.

Cork, Nov. 19, 1786.

REV. ARTHUR O'LEARY'S ADDRESS

To the Lords Spiritual and Temporal of the Parliament of Great Britain: to which is added, an account of Sir Henry Mildmay's Bill relative to Nuns.

My Lords,

When I have the honour to address the most august Assembly on earth, and under the impression which injured honour must feel from an unmerited and horrid accusation that implies whatever can disgrace the human heart, and changes a Christian clergyman into an infernal being, even before he is stripped of the spoils of mortality, I cannot be ignorant of the delicacy of my situation, lest conscious, but defenceless rectitude should tempt me, even in the most agitated frame of mind, to make use of any unguarded word, which, though inadvertently, may give the slightest offence.

But in bringing the complaints of injured honour into the sanctuary of honour itself, I claim your Lordship's indulgence if I presume to introduce myself under the designation which points out my person and character, to such members of your illustrious body as I have not the honour of being known to.

I am a Catholic clergyman, a native of Ireland, well known in that kingdom for having inculcated loyalty to my Sovereign, and subordination to the laws, in the most critical times, by my writings, my sermons, and example. For the truth of this assertion I could refer to the speeches delivered

in the Irish House of Commons on a former occasion, and to the kingdom at large. Nor was my loyalty the effect of imperious necessity, or time-serving policy; for in France, where, in consequence of barbarous and Gothic laws, I was forced in my early days to seek for a small portion of that education which I had been refused in the land of my fathers, where the youth of Europe had been instructed gratis, in the time of Ireland's splendour. In France, where the Catholics of Ireland had seminaries and convents, with full admission to all the degrees and honours of her Universities, I resisted every solicitation to enlist any of the subjects of these kingdoms in the French king's service, though I had then every opportunity, being appointed to superintend prisons and hospitals, during the wars of fifty-seven, &c. until about the arrival of the then Duke of Bedford in Paris. It was my interest to recommend myself to the favour of the people in power, and consequently, more my interest to become a courtier than a moralist. Saint Paul calls God to witness when he asserts the truth, I can do the same when I assert that conscience was the rule of my conduct; and, whatever the uninformed may think of my creed, I would not perjure myself for all the Crowns and Sceptres on earth.

Thus far I thought it incumbent on me to say something of myself, in order to shew that not a single feature in my character corresponds with the picture, of the exhibition whereof, I have such room to complain. I have taken the oath of allegiance to his Majesty with the rest of the Catholic clergy of Ireland; as then we are amenable to Government, and fulfil our part of the covenant, we think ourselves entitled to the protection of the laws both as to our persons and honour. Our persons have been hitherto secure from insult; how long they may be so is uncertain, if the public can believe that we answer the description given of us in a short publication to which the editor has prefixed the name of a very considerable person, who is presumed to know the state of Ireland, or who ought to know it better. For if our lineaments bear even the slightest resemblance to the portrait he is said to have drawn, we ought to be swept from society as serpents horrid to sight, and pests deadly to human nature,

And as to honour, if what this publication sets forth, be true, we have by far less claim to it than the Cartouches, or Bagshots: for, the publication, after enlarging upon the civilization and other happy effects of the Union of Ireland with Great Britain, reckons, amongst others, the following remarkable one: 'It will entice the Clergy to more con-'stant residence, by which means the pernicious influence 'of the vagrant Catholic Priest, who goes about selling ab-'solution for felonies, and all sorts of crimes, even murder 'itself, would be lessened, and in a great measure done 'away.'

Horrid and barbarous accusation! which describes the Catholic Priests of Ireland as the most detestable of the human race, venders of sacrilege, profanation, murder, and felony; and their flocks as so many licensed criminals and patentees of guilt, in purchasing their absolutions for the perpetration of the most horrid deeds. The vagrant Catholic Priests selling absolutions for felonies, all sorts of crimes, even murder.

I am as great a friend to the Union, and have reconciled, I believe, as many to it, as the person to whom the publication is attributed. I am a friend to it from, as I imagined, a well-founded expectation, that it will close the tumultuary scenes which have distracted my ill-fated country for ages; and make the natives, of every religious description, happy: a people united, not in a league against Great Britain, but united with her and amongst themselves in interest, prosperity, and power; by a free and equal participation of all benefits and advantages arising in the state, and by the removal of those jealousies which ever subsist between kingdoms or states, standing in the same relation to each other as England has stood hitherto with respect to Ireland—the one subordinate to the other, and governed by viceroys, and both but half united. Divisions, jealousies, and their concomitant evils, must be the natural consequence. Such was the state of Norway, with regard to Denmark, until united. Such was the state of Portugal with regard to Spain, and of Flanders with regard to Austria, until separated. And such would be the state of Ireland with regard to England, until wedded together in the bands of a close and intimate

union; or divorced from each other by a solemn irrevocable deed of separation. For the calamities of Ireland are not originally and radically owing to difference in religious opinions. The kingdoms and states above mentioned professed the same creed. There is nothing unsociable in the character of Irishmen, any more than in the character of Germans; amongst whom, in some places, Lutherans, Calvinists, and Catholics, perform their respective worship, on Sundays, in the same church. Amidst such a multiplicity of penal laws, some of which persecuted the dead body to the grave, in forbidding, under certain penalties, to bury any Catholic in the ruins of an old abbey, though built ages before by his ancestors; no Catholic could scarce have breathed outside the bars of a jail, had it not been for the liberality of our Protestant neighbours, who were too generous to enforce them. All the liberal-minded Protestants in Ireland are for the emancipation of the Catholics to this very day. And such as are under any bias now, would soon give up their prejudices, or rather, would never have indulged any, if the law had made no distinction.

Long before the magic sound of Protestant and Papist, like the Trojan trumpet, had given the signal to marshal them, as hostile armies against each other, on account of their creeds—an insiduous and destructive policy was at a loss how to divide the natives of Ireland, after they had sheathed the sword, and coalesced into one extensive and friendly family. It had not then the plea of difference of religion, for their religion was the same: nor the plea of interest, for it is the interest of the inhabitants of the same land to live in peace and harmony. At last it compassed, by playing on the passions, what it could not have effected by either religion or interest.

The Irish nobility and gentry of the Milesian race wore long beards, in which they gloried; the Government of that time got an act of parliament passed, called the Glib Act, whereby every Irish nobleman, of English or Norman extraction, was to forfeit the privileges of his original country if he did not shave the upper lip. Thus the warlike fools renewed the bloody contest, for the splitting of a hair, with as much fury as the two famous factions, in the reign of

Justinian, quarrelled on account of the colour of their clothes; or, as the sectaries of Ali and Omar fight, to this very day, about the orthodox cut that should be given to a Mahometan's beard. And I consider such of the Protestant and Catholics of Ireland full as great fanatics and fools as the former, if their creed be the cause of their quarrel; not that I am such a latitudinarian as to believe all religions alike. But true religion, instead of inspiring hatred and rancour, commands us to love and pity those who are in error.

The fleecy beard, and the glib or smooth lip, were both forgotten a few years after the Reformation, in the appellation of *Protestant and Papist;* and thus the same sanguinary system has been continued, with few interruptions, for too long a time, to the destruction of a kingdom, which, from its happy situation, the commodiousness of its harbours, the temperature of its climate, the fertility of its soil, the manly and generous dispositions of its inhabitants, would realize whatever poets have feigned concerning Fortunate Islands, and Hesperian Gardens. To do away the jealousy which may hereafter operate to the same destructive effect, by playing off the natives against each other, to their mutual provocation and obstruction to the happiness and prosperity of their common country, was the chief motive which influenced my mind in recommending the Union, as the only effectual preventive.

As to the happy effect of the Union, by making the residence of the clergy a check on the pernicious influence of the vagrant Catholic priest, who sells his absolution for all sorts of crimes; it is as fancifully imagined, as it is delicately expressed. The parson hereby assumes the office of an exciseman to seize the contraband absolutions of the priest, who becomes a smuggler—a well conceived plan for increasing the revenues of Ireland, and refining the manners of her inhabitants! The Protestant and Catholic clergy of Ireland have lived together, for years, in the habits of freedom and friendship; when, by the laws of the country, the latter were doomed to transportation for performing their religious functions, the clergy of the established church, never turned informers, nor applied to Members of Parliament, for the

purpose of swelling with new laws, the enormous penal code, on account of literary disputes. It is not from each other they have any thing to fear; but both have every thing to dread from the disciples of the New Philosophy, which has made a rapid progress amongst their respective flocks; at the root of this system, and not against any branch of the Christian religion, which professes obedience to the laws, the axe of power should be laid: and nothing cherishes the growth of infidelity more than publications which tend to expose the pastors to the derision and contempt of those who were accustomed, and whose duty it was, to respect them.

It is needless to have recourse to France, where the *priests'* cassock began to be considered by the higher orders as an antiquated dress; and the lower classes, who afterwards burnt the castle, and shed the blood of these nobles, learned disrespect for their teachers from their example. Ireland has of late afforded but too melancholy an instance of the truth of this remark. The habit of respect and submission to their clergy, was in such a manner an earnest pledge of the obedience of the common people to the state, that amidst so many wars and rebellions, since the Revolution, until the destruction of monarchy in France, Ireland was not one single hour tainted with the spirit of rebellion. Lord Chesterfield, on his return from his Viceroyship, informed George II. that he had met in Ireland but two dangerous Papists of whom his Majesty should be aware—two ladies of the names of Devereux, who had danced at the Castle on the King's birth night. All the Viceroys of Ireland, from Lord Chesterfield to Earl Camden, could have made much a similar answer, if interrogated concerning what is called the danger of Popery.

If a number of the common people, in some countries, were seduced from the peaceable line of conduct, which they had hitherto pursued, the chief cause will, as it ought to be ascribed to their disobedience to their pastors; in consequence of the industrious propagation of Tom Paine's pernicious principles, and the artifices of people of power and consequence, of a religion, if any they had, different from the Catholic persuasion. Other collateral causes can be

assigned which it is the province of the impartial historian to detail, when he lays open the hidden springs of public transactions. But means were used to weaken the confidence of the people in their pastors, by representing them as so many impostors, leagued with Government for their oppression.*

In the American war, when the combined fleets of France and Spain were riding triumphant in the British Channel, almost all the English forces engaged beyond the Atlantic, and Ireland destitute of any regular defence, except a few dismounted dragoons, the loyal and peaceable conduct of the common people, attentive to the instructions of their pastors, could be equalled only by the union and exertions of the higher orders for the protection of the kingdom.

Many instances could I adduce, in which the peaceful voice of the priest was more effectual to quell riots and disturbances, than the thunder of the cannon could have been. In proportion as this influence is weakened in a kingdom situated as Ireland is, the spirit of insubordination and infidelity will strengthen. Remove the restraints of religion, from men of strong passions, irritable dispositions, and desperate courage—let the influence of their priests be destroyed, they will become infidels. The kingdom will be then chiefly divided between the infidels of the South, who will have no religion, and the Dissenters of the North, whose religion breathes freedom and independence on hierarchial Government.

The maxim laid down by Doctor Law, a Protestant Bishop, equally eminent for learning and liberality, is by far more consistent with Christianity and sound policy. 'By far 'the greatest part of my diocesans,' said this illustrious prelate, 'are of the Roman Catholic persuasion. I cannot make

* This is so true, that the United Irishmen universally execrate the Catholic Clergy, as concurring both to disunite and prevent any accession of strength, by their sermons and pastoral instructions: and impute partly the frustration of their plans, to these very priests, so cruelly libelled by others, from whom more candour and justice might be expected. The clergy of both religions must stand or fall together. In all appearance, had the rebellion succeeded, there would be none but Consitutional Priests and Ministers, as immoral as their Republican flocks.

'good Protestants of them, I wish to make good Catholics 'of them; and with this intention I put into their hands the 'Works of Doctor Gother, an eminent Catholic divine.'

If Doctor Law's maxim be followed—if, instead of having the people eternally harassed on the score of religion, every one rests in peace under his own vine and fig-tree, a Catholic priest, respected by his flock, will be a safer guard to a Protestant clergyman, than a regiment of the best disciplined soldiers.

'Let us uncatholicise France,' said Mirabeau, 'otherwise 'we can never establish a Republican Government.' It is then much safer for the state to continue the Catholic catechism in the hands of the common people, who are accustomed to it, than to expose them to the danger of having Tom Paine's Age of Reason substituted in its room. And his Majesty will be more secure on his throne, when a Catholic clergyman recommends him and the Royal Family to God, from the altar, than when a fifth monarchy man, after reading in his Bible, *thou shalt bind their kings in chains, and their nobles in fetters of iron*, acknowledges no king but King Jesus; or, when Regicides inscribe on the muzzles of their guns, *Lord, thou wilt open my lips, and my mouth shall sing forth thy praise.* The History of England affords but too many melancholy proofs of it.

As to the blessings of civilization which are to be extended to Ireland by the Union, any insinuation, that the Irish stand in need of it more than their neighbours, must hurt their pride.

I suppose he means the lower orders of the people of Ireland. All philosophical and unprejudiced travellers, who have observed with attention their customs and manners, acknowledge that they surpass the lower orders of any other country, in generosity, wit, vivacity, manliness and activity. It is not at St. Giles, or Wapping, where their manners and morals are vitiated by the contagion of example, that the character of the lower orders of the Irish is to be known. It is in the inland and mountainous parts of Ireland, where bare-footed boys study the classics; and where the civility of the common people to strangers, and to each other, distinguishes them as much from Dutch boors, and

the rustics of other countries, as education distinguishes a well-bred man from a clown. It is not civilization, but bread and employment they stand in need of: and if it be true, that language and music were the first civilizers that softened the savage manners of unpolished man; it seems, from the inharmonious stile of the author of a publication, which identifies, by a grammatical apposition, a Catholic priest and a vagrant—that he has not such a stock of civilization to spare, as to be enabled to divide it with others without impoverishing himself. Though his rank in life entitles him to range in those circles, one of whose first rules is that of good breeding, if the name which the editor has prefixed to the publication be not fictitious.

The Catholic clergy of Ireland, my Lords, are not vagrants: they claim their descent from the most ancient and noble families in that kingdom; and, though pride of birth attaches no consequence either to their persons or profession, in the eyes of the patrons of *liberty and equality*, yet it must have weight with your Lordships. For in Monarchies, where, according to Montesquieu, there must be gradations of ranks, and nobles, like your Lordships, whose titles and privileges are descendable to their posterity, a certain regard must be paid to lineage and pedigree; and if the day should ever happen (which heaven avert) when the gentleman should be confounded with the clown, and the priest with the vagrant, away with the coronet and the armorial bearings. My name is *Equality*, said the late Duke of Orleans: the unhappy man prophesied! His head fell, with equal honour, from the edge of the guillotine into the same basket with the head of the *sans-culotte*. If then the author of the worse than illiberal publication, alluded to in this address, be that man of consequence, whose name the editor has prefixed to it, he forgets himself, and the regard due to dignity of rank, and the rules of common decency, when he treats gentlemen of family, and of a liberal education, such as the Catholic clergy of Ireland, with millions of times less ceremony than it would be in his power to treat a pilfering crew of strolling gipsies. *The vagrant Catholic priest selling his absolutions for all sorts of crimes, felonies, &c. &c.*

The ancestors, my Lords, of the Catholic clergy of Ireland, had the religion which the Christian world professed, and the estates and castles of their fathers, ages before Tudors or Stuarts had ascended the British throne. From the contemporary historians of their own and of other nations, and ancient monuments, daily rescued from ruins and watery wastes, their character must be drawn: not from Hume, and similar historians, as unfaithful in their narratives with regard to Ireland, as they are infidels with regard to Revelation.

Amidst the various changes that happened in Europe, the descendants of those Catholics preserved their religion, which persecution contributed to rivet deeper into their minds; as, the more the wind attempted to strip the traveller of his cloak, the closer he held it. But their estates and castles they lost, rather than renounce their duty to God, and their allegiance to their kings; one of whom had the base ingratitude to confirm to Cromwell's soldiers, tinged with his royal father's blood, the lands of the nobility and gentry who had fought his father's battles and his own.*

In addition to our losses under the usurpation of Cromwell, and subsequent ones at the Revolution, our most invaluable privileges were swept away at a political game of hazard, played by Whigs and Tories, under the last of the Stuarts, without the slightest provocation on our part For the laws framed in Queen Anne's reign against the Catholics of Ireland, are of so horrid a complexion, that it was never the intention of those who devised them to have them enacted: their very cruelty was the only motive for inventing them.

Queen Anne, whose father had been a mendicant, supported by the generosity of a foreign king, was suspected of wishing that her brother, a Catholic prince, should succeed her. The party, to whom her Ministers were obnoxious, intended to draw on them the odium of purposing to place the Pretender on the throne. With this view, they framed a code of laws, authorising the neighbour to plunder the neighbour, the brother to supplant the brother, and the pro-

* The wills and deeds of numbers of these forfeitures are deposited in the British Museum.

fligate son to strip the father of his estate and to make him tenant for life, only by taking an oath of abjuration; with a variety of other penal clauses equally cruel and unjust. The very severity of laws, clashing with those of God and nature, gave them every room to believe that they would be opposed by the court party, from principles of humanity and justice. And thus they flattered themselves with the success of an expedient, calculated to expose their opponents to the hatred entertained at the time against those who were deemed the friends of the *Pope and the Pretender.*

The shrewd courtiers, aware of the design of their antagonists, and, either willing to sacrifice justice and humanity to their personal interest, or flattering themselves that the laws would be but of short duration, in the event of the success of their plan, unexpectedly gave into the measure, to remove the suspicion of their design. It was too late for the other party to recede; and thus, in the time of profound peace, in violation of a solemn compact, sanctioned by the laws of nations, the Catholics of Ireland, like balls in a tennis-court, struck with the rackets of both parties, were thrown over the walls of the constitution of their country, against the original intention of the state gamesters.

If rulers and statesmen, long since resolved into their original dust, have handed down to us restraints and disqualifications as a legal inheritance, it is their fault and our misfortune, but not a reason which authorises those to whom the destinies have been more propitious, to aggravate our calamities, by loading us with gross slander, and worse than degrading epithets, *venders of murders, and purchasers of felonies!* Neither is this an age for the triumph of overbearing contempt towards the descendants of the victims of the revolutions of former times, when Europe is threatened with a more extraordinary revolution than that which has reduced the Catholics of Ireland to their present situation.

Solomon said, in his time, *nothing new under the Sun.* About a century and a half ago, England's King was brought to the scaffold; her princes and nobles, and other loyalists, emigrants in France and other countries, where they were hospitably received, as the emigrants of those countries are

now in their turn generously received in England, and in derision of the peerage, draymen were placed by an usurper, in that very house where your Lordships shine with such lustre.

Little it was expected, about a century ago, when a prince of the House of Orange was seated on the British Throne, after having placed a guard over James the Second, his father-in-law, in the palace of Hampton Court, that his successor in the Stadtholdership of Holland, dethroned by his rebellious subjects, would be under the necessity of taking up his residence in the very same palace where a King of England had been a kind of prisoner before: an awful instance of the vicissitudes of human affairs; which should inspire princes themselves with humanity and compassion for the oppressed—when they not only know that they are doomed to die as other mortals, but moreover exposed, from the inconstancy of fortune, to survive their power. *Go*, said Marius, once the master of Rome, and conqueror of the Cimbri, *go and tell the Governor of Africa, that you have seen Marius perishing with hunger on the ruins of Carthage*, alluding to the instability of human grandeur, in the downfal of such a powerful state, and the change of his own fortune.

When we see kingdoms and empires fall, as it were, upon one another—when we see kings and queens, a few years back the idols of their subjects, eclipsing in splendour the pomp and magnificence of Oriental grandeur—when we see them bleeding on scaffolds, and their bodies deprived of those funeral rites which decency owes to humanity, we are convinced that uncertainty, inconstancy, and agitation, are the proper portions of all sublunary affairs; and the greatest abuse of power is to triumph and insult over oppressed innocence.

The Catholic clergy of Ireland should not then be singled out as objects of defamation and invective, for having fallen victims to those reverses of fortune to which crowned heads, princes and nobles are exposed. In their poverty they have birth and honour, which neither revolutions nor penal laws can affect: no immoral man is ever allowed to officiate at their altars: when their prelates, who are ever watchful over

the inferior clergy, discover any who depart from the line of duty required by the sanction of their profession, they suspend or excommunicate them, and thus cut them off from the communion of the Catholic church.

The same laws that encouraged the son to disobey and strip the Catholic father of his property, encouraged the refractory clergyman to set the injunctions and admonitions of his bishops at defiance, by taking the oath of abjuration: for, as an encouragement to outward conformity, the laws of Ireland allow forty pounds a year to every priest who reads his recantation, whether he be a moral man or not.

\- - - - - - - - - -
\- - - - - - - - - -
\- - - - - - - - - -
\- - - - - - - - - -

In a word, nothing whatever is required to become an elect of the state, but the outward utterance of the oath of abjuration, whether it is believed by the person who takes it, or whether it belies his heart. All the punishments and legal disqualifications are reserved for the retainers of conscious integrity, who sacrifice all worldly interests rather than swear against the dictates of their conscience, and thus do not choose to perjure themselves, and impose on their neighbours. In the very supposition that they err, (which is the supposition of others, not theirs,) they err in their honesty; for no road can be right to the man who walks in it against conviction. And this circumstance alone is more than an ample refutation of the impious and hell-invented charge *of a Catholic priest selling absolutions for all sorts of crimes, felonies, and murders:* for if there were priests who had such commodities for sale, and Catholics to purchase them, long before now the Catholic noblemen would have been seated in the House of Peers with your Lordships in legislating for the lands. Every obstacle would be soon removed; one single oath would be the penacea which would cure all disorders: we see ourselves excluded from all the dignities and places of emolument in the state. In consequence of this exclusion we see ourselves abused by the very dregs and lees of the peasantry of our country; such as Doctor Duigninane,

the son of a peasant who had read his recantation to be schoolmaster to poor children in a charity school, now ranking with the senators in the land, and realizing in our days what Solomon complained of as one of the evils incident to human nature—*Another evil I have seen under the sun, I have seen servants or beggars on horses, and princes walking on the earth, or on foot*, Ecclesiastes 10. Not that I would reproach any man with the meanness of his birth, when I would see Apollo crown modest merit. But when a vulgar man, under the shield of penal laws, is continually insulting, in the grossest manner, the majority of an entire kingdom, as if they were a group of African slaves on a West India plantation, under the lash of a brutal driver—when, on the other hand, we are told in the most public manner, that we have dispensations and absolutions for the commission of all sorts of crimes, I feel such a conflict within myself, that I am obliged to summon up all my religion, lest I should yield to the temptation of hating a man I am bound to forgive. I am at a loss which to admire most of the two, either the power of conscience over the heart of man, or the unaccountable stupidity, the perverse and wilful blindness of any person who claims the slightest pretention to reason or good sense, and yet seriously thinks that unprincipled men, licenced by their religious principles, and authorized by their clergy to commit all sorts of crimes, could hesitate one instant to have recourse to so slight a remedy as an oath to remove every grievance, and silence every obloquy.

The feelings of honour, the pride of rank, the allurements of fortune and dignities, every impulse of the human heart, and all the motives that influence man as a member of society, call aloud on us to remove the disgraceful restraints that expose us to such humiliations and obloquy. And yet, with the remedy in our hands, the churches open, and this pretended stock of absolutions, which, according to the report of slander, would sanctify all sorts of crimes, we keep at a distance from the temple of fame, power, and splendour.

When the Pagans accused the primitive Christians of

eating children at their religious assemblies, and rising after supper to conclude all in the confusion of incest, Tertullian addressed his apology to the Roman senate, and calls upon them to prove the truth of the fact. He appeals afterwards to the feelings of humanity, common to Pagans and Christians, whether such crimes could be the religion of any society of mortals. O, said he, *what immortal glory would a pro-consul gain, could he pull out a Christian by the ears, that had eat up an hundred children.* But we despair *of any such glorious discovery.*

I call aloud upon the Viceroys of Ireland, their Secretaries, and the Judges of the land, to name or to recollect one single instance in which a crime, murder or felony has been committed, in consequence of a priestly absolution. Where was the gallows erected, on the branches of which the absolved murderer and the absolving priest were suspended together—the one the perpetrator, the other the instigator of the crime? Or where is that nation on earth, even in times of Paganism, where the religion of the people authorized the commission of all sorts of crimes?

The Romans, who worshipped an adulterous Jupiter, yet punished adultery by the Julian law. The Senator who had offered incense to Bacchus, could not abide his wife when he discovered that her breath was too fragrant with the flavour of wine. The impure Venus was a goddess worshipped by the matrons of ancient Rome, yet Lucretia was chaste. The civil magistrate punished on earth the crimes that were worshipped in heaven. There exists then in the heart of man a law which points out to him, according to the Apostle, his moral duty—an innate principle of justice and goodness, by which, even in spite of the false maxims of his worship, the unregenerate Pagan condemned the immoral actions of himself and others.

The Catholics of Ireland, natives of a nation of heroes and an island of saints, are they to form the most singular of all exceptions to the maxims of nature, by not only sanctifying crimes, but by also making them a saleable commodity?

We who spend our time in enforcing the maxims of the

Gospel, one of whose principal laws is a law of eternal love: who teach our flocks to relieve the distressed, without distinction of sects or countries, to return good for evil—to discover a brother in the face of an enemy—to embrace affliction—to smile under calamity—to pluck out the eye that gives offence—to cut off the hand that scandalizes—to renounce all the honours, riches, and pleasures of the world, when they cannot be attained but at the risk of the soul, and to consider death in grace as a passage to a glorious and blissful eternity.

Are we such monsters as to be slaves to tenets so abhorrent to human nature?

I imagined, my Lords, that the solemn oaths and declarations of the Catholics of those kingdoms, and their renunciation of these privileges and rights, to which they would be otherwise entitled, rather than swear against their consciences, had sufficiently refuted accusations, at which nature recoils and shrinks with horror: but to our astonishment and surprise, our creed is not learned from ourselves. More credit is given to a fanatical geographer called Guthrie, than to our oaths, or the writings of our doctors. In this theological sum, our divinity is chiefly studied, and Guthrie informs his readers, that he has extracted from a book called: *Rome, the Great Custom-House of sin, translated into English* 150 *years ago, the fees of the Pope's Chancery for absolutions.* He might have said, instead of translated into English, composed in English originally. I never read such a book in the canon law, nor such fees amongst the rules of the Pope's Chancery; however, he classes the fees in the following order.*

For him who stole consecrated things in a holy place, ten shillings and six-pence.

For him who lays with a woman in a church, nine shillings.

For him that killeth father, mother, wife or sister, ten shillings.

For him that layeth with his mother, sister, or grandmother, seven shillings and six-pence.

* Guthrie's Geographical Grammar, sixteenth edition, corrected and enlarged. London, printed 1796.

This is the cheapest bargain a pious customer could expect, and I think there is good profit in dealing with the Pope, as a great number of other sins are not taxed at all, such as sleeping with a neighbour's wife, stealing a fat ox, &c. These are only as a few grains thrown into the scale, when a person buys some pounds of sugar in a grocer's shop. They are but peccadillos or trifles. It appears, however, that the Pope's are but bad financiers in not increasing the custom-house duties in the space of about 150 years, whereas every article costs now treble what it cost then; but especially, as things rise in value, according to the rarity, the Pope's custom rates were ill regulated in not charging sixpence or a shilling more for the *grandmother* than for the sister or grand-daughter, as most certainly an old *Hebe*, the *grandmother of the graces*, is a greater rarity than a young woman or grand-daughter. In vain should we attempt to disclaim this ludricous and impious creed. The public are so accustomed to slander and misrepresentation, that few will believe us.

The rules of the Roman Chancery, *Regulæ Cancellariæ*, regard benefices, the temporalities of vacant bishoprics, and other ecclesiastical matters, partly spiritual, partly temporal, according to concordatums or stipulations between the Apostolical See, and Catholic Princes. The incests and sacrileges above mentioned, instead of being compounded for money, would be punished with death on the rack or wheel, after making the *amendé honorable*, with a lighted taper held by the criminal, on his knees before the door of the church where the sacrilege had been committed. Sixtus Quintus condemned to the gallies, for the space of five years, a nobleman for raising the veil of a lady whom he met in the street, and giving her a kiss. And in vain did a polygamist plead that he was unfortunate in each of his wives, and for that reason changed them in expectation of finding one that would please him.

As it is so hard to please you in this world, replied the stern Pontiff, *there are more women in the other world, you must go there to find one to your liking*--ordered him to be tried and executed.

Thus, if Rome be the great custom-house of sins, a London printer's office is the great custom-house of false creeds and fictitious absolutions, for real absolutions can never be granted but upon sincere repentance, which requires three indispensable conditions: a sincere sorrow for past sins, a firm resolution to guard against future lapses, and every atonement in our power to the injured Deity and the injured neighbour. Without these conditions absolutions are no more than the mutterings of sorcerers, or words of incantion pronounced over a dead body, without ever imparting to it the genial heat of animation and vitality. The ministers of religion can do no more than God has annexed to their commissions; and the Scriptures declare, that God will never forgive the sinner without sorrow and repentance, which implies a purpose of amendment for life.

Sacramental confession then, and priestly absolution, instead of being an encouragement to sin, are in the Catholic religion the greatest restraints on the passions, The worst and most immoral Catholics are those who neglect them, because they prefer their passions to their duty. And if it be asked, why have recourse to those religious rites, whereas people may sin afterwards?

The reason is: because man in this life is not impeachable, on account of the changeableness and inconstancy of his will. All he can do is to form the strongest resolutions, to lay hold on the means, which in his belief, God has appointed for his sanctification, and to recommend himself to infinite mercy. Hence the caution given by the Apostle, Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall.

God has promised to receive the sinner whenever he would return, without limiting the number of times. Yet to sin in expectation of forgiveness, would be the most unjustifiable presumption. Mercy is not to be abused, nor is Divine Justice to be provoked by new prevarications and new crimes. For there are times when the measure is filled up, and fatal limits, beyond which paternal goodness does not extend.

Were priestly abolution, which is founded on the power granted by Christ to remit sins to the penitent sinner, a license for guilt, it would be unjust to charge it on the Catholics alone—Lutherans, Greeks, Armenians, all branches of the Christian religion, except Calvinists, and the modern sectaries sprung from that stock, acknowledge this power. The Church of England, in her liturgy, recommends, acknowledges it, and lays down the form of absolution in the very same words used by the Roman Catholic Church. The laws of the state sanction the inviolable secresy which is observed, when the sinner, loaded with guilt, lays open his hidden sores to his spiritual physician; whereas the laws do not allow that what is told in confession should be adduced in evidence on a trial; and by a statute passed in the reign of James I. the minister is degraded for ever, if he reveals the confession of his penitent. But the ill-fated Catholic is the expiatory victim on whose head all the iniquities of the nation are laid; and what is harmless in others, is criminal in him.*

It is painful in me, my Lords, thus to intrude on your time. It is the more painful, as after so many proofs of the loyalty, the piety, the zeal, and exertions of the Catholic prelates and pastors of Ireland, in the critical circumstances, when there was no room for dissimulation, or a trimming, fluctuating conduct, threats should be held out for the abolition of their priesthood, as the nursery of *crimes*, *felonies*, *and murders*.

In addition to these threats, by a man of consequence, on the eve of a union which they imagined was to close the penal code with the sevenfold seal of eternal silence; and at the very threshold of the Temple of Concord, they and their flocks are justly alarmed to see the pages of the mysterious

* I do not write in this address as a controvertist, or polemical divine; I only expound the Catholic belief, so often and so grossly misrepresented, and whose ministers are exposed to obloquy on account of pretended absolution.

The primitive fathers, in addressing their apologies to a pagan senate, explained their belief, to vindicate it from misrepresentation. I have every confidence that a Christian senate will not be less indulgent to a Christian Clergyman.

book, in which, like that mentioned by the Prophet, are written so many lamentations and woes, unfolded by a member of the British House of Commons, for the purpose of knowing whether there be any more penal clauses wanting, in order to make up the deficiency, by enacting a new law which hereafter may afflict their children and relatives. I mean, my Lords, Sir Henry Mildmay's bill, relative to what is called Monastic Institutions.

From a coincidence of circumstances it seems to appear, that the idea has been suggested to that gentleman, in consequence of a very uninteresting dispute between two very learned, and in all other respects very amiable ecclesiastics, Doctor Sturges, a prebendary of Winchester, and Doctor Milner, a Catholic historian. and member of the Society of Antiquarians, about Bishop Headley's writings.

Mr. Milner has published a very learned and curious history of Winchester, under the successive dynasties of British, Saxon, and English kings, from the earliest records of time, down to our days. As an antiquarian, he describes the monuments of worthies buried in the Cathedral; as a historian, he draws their characters. It is too voluminous to read by any but a few rich, who can purchase it. It is out of the reach of the generality of the English nation, who would be more pleased with Fielding's Tom Jones, or Jonathan Wild: though it for ever ranks Mr. Milner in the first class of the literary characters of the age, and should rather procure him the thanks of the inhabitants of Winchester, for having rescued the history of their city from the mist and rubbish of antiquity, and given such elegant engravings of their monuments, than the animadversions of some of its ecclesiastical dignitaries.

Unfortunately for some English ladies, who, in their early days, had made vows of celibacy in France and Flanders, and had taken refuge in their native land, from the poniards guillotines of French assassins, the antiquarian, after describing the monuments of several illustrious men in succession, came to that of Bishop Hoadley. This prelate, to the exception of his moral character, which was spotless, might have been called the Perigord or Gregoire of his time, with

regard to his theological principles in ecclesiastical matters, submitting religion to the civil magistrates, &c. A representation was drawn up against him, and his writings, by the lower House of Convocation in 1717, as tending to subvert all government and discipline in the church of Christ, and to reduce it to a state of anarchy and confusion: and as making void those powers with which he himself was vested, and which he was bound to exercise in conferring orders, inflicting censures, &c.

The ministry of the day, with whom Bishop Hoadley was a favourite, dissolved the Convocation, prevented the representation from being carried to the Bishops in the higher house, and thus dispersed the clouds that were thickening over Bishop Hoadley's head.

In describing his monument, as an antiquarian, it was natural for Mr. Milner to draw the prelate's character as a historian; and to represent him in attitude analogous to his principles, with the Bible in one hand, and Magna Charta in the other; the mitre and the cap of liberty in contact; the crozier and the pike set in saltire, or crossing each other. Mr. Milner complaining that one of the pillars of the cathedral of Winchester, was cut too great a depth to make place for Bishop Hoadley's monument, adds, thus Bishop Hoadley, both living and dead, undermined the church of which he had been a prelate.*

Doctor Sturges, as he himself acknowledges, had been under particular obligations to Bishop Hoadley, and in all appearance had imbibed, if not all, at least the best of his opinions. Gratitude and friendship, two of the human virtues the most congenial to our feelings as men, but often hurrying us into excesses which we cannot canonize as Christians, warmed Dr. Sturges' breast in such a manner, that he imparted a congenial heat to the embers of the dead, and reproduced on the stage a character, who, notwithstanding the change of scenes, will ever and invariably play the same part, which to confuse and perplex, to have friends and foes, and to leave the following problem to solve: Whether

* Milner's Survey of Winchester.

he was really and in his heart, a professor of the thirty-nine articles, one of which determines with the Catholic church, the institution of Bishops, *jure divino?* Or whether he was one of those accommodating sages, who, like the philosopher of old, laid down as a rule, that a wise man should have two religions, one for himself, and another for the country and time in which he lives? The solution of this problem, I leave to Doctor Sturges and Mr. Milner.

It is a problem, the solution whereof concerns no more the present generation than the religion of Grotius, on which the famous Bossuet has written a dissertation.

Few persons read Hoadley, whose style is so incoherent and unentertaining, that Pope, in allusion to the length of his periods, said Hoadley walks a mile. To it can be applied the remark of a Roman Emperor on the style of Seneca: '*arena sine calse*, sand without cement.' Doctor Sturges, however, took offence at the character Mr. Milner had drawn of his favourite bishop, and instead of confining himself in point to the dispute, adopted the most effectual method of rallying round his standard a host of confederates, by making a general cause of it and publishing a work under the title of *Reflections on Popery;* a theme so often enlarged on pro and con by the most eminent men the world has ever produced, that it is impossible to say any thing new on the subject.

Mr. Milner, as an historian, depicted the eminent men of religious orders, who had reflected lustre on the church of Winchester, in the same colours that any impartial Protestant historian would have done, as several of them have. He does the same justice to such of the Protestant Bishops of Winchester, as deserved to have their birth, education, learning, and virtues celebrated.

Doctor Sturges, inattentive to the labours and learning of the members of religious orders, who have preserved the literary monuments of ancient times from the ravages of Goths and Vandals—followed the sun in its course in converting barbarous nations—carried the light of the Gospel into those distant climes unknown to the conquerors of the ancient and new world—brought Europe acquainted with the natural productions, the laws, the manners, customs, religions,

and geography of the remotest regions, and enriched the republic of letters with the treasures of literature both ancient and modern. He overlooks the benefits they have conferred on the world, in their fasts and celibacy, which he attacks with as much vehemence and zeal as Salvian attacks the vices and disorders of his time.

The prayers, mortification, penance of monastic institutions, all must yield with Doctor Sturges to the *irresistible impulse of nature. The impulse of nature*—the source of all our disorders and miseries, which all legislators on earth made it their constant study to restrain by laws and punishments. What made an adulterer of David? *The impulse of nature.*——An incestuous of Amnon? *The impulse of nature.*——A rebel of Absolem? *The impulse of nature.*——A murderer of Cain? *The impulse of nature.*——What gives employment to the canonists and civilians of Doctors Commons, in arguing the cases of divorce? *The impulse of nature.*——What peoples London with so many votaries of the Cyprian Goddess? *The impulse of nature.*——What is it that brought the impure spirit into the body of that man, concerning whom our Saviour said, there is *a kind of devil which cannot be cast out, but by prayer and fasting? The impulse of nature.* His zeal against celibacy, and mortification, hurries him into such extremes that he blames Mr. Milner for being so lavish in his encomiums on the Protestant Bishops of Winchester, the most distinguished for their virtues, though Mr. Milner quotes their monumental inscriptions, recorded by Protestant authors, such as Bishop Andrews, who lived in a state of celibacy. *Cælebs hinc, migravit ad aurlolam celestem*, and Bishop Morley, amongst whose many virtues is reckoned the austerity of his life, eating but once in twenty-four hours, and rising every morning in the coldest weather and without a fire, at five o'clock.

He is never more eloquent, than when he declaims against fast and celibacy. In support of his arguments against celibacy, he quotes Lucretius, an Epicurian poet and philosopher, who invokes Venus, the Goddess of lust; and Walter de Mapes, an unchaste *bon vivant*, who wrote doggerel verses in latin in the twelfth century.

Meum est propositum in taberna mori.
Vinum sit appositum morientus ori.*

They are certainly the best authorities he could quote against virginal chastity, and the mortification of the senses. For he could not quote Saint Paul or the fathers against either one or the other. If Saint Jerome were living, he would write an epistle to Doctor Sturges with the same warmth, with which he wrote to Vigilantius.

The Doctor has reserved Bishop Hoadley's apology for an appendix, in which he makes use of words, which, from Mr. Milner or me, would render us obnoxious to the Bishops of both persuasions.

They are the following:—*As an Ecclesiastic, he* (Bishop Hoadley) *withstood the high pretensions of great part of the Clergy—pretensions unauthorised by reason, maintained by a violent party spirit, and often employed in the most tumultuary and factious purposes to which the cry of the church was made subservient.* This *cry*, which he does not seem to approve in the hierarchy, soon became the cry of some of the prebendaries of Winchester, and from them the *cry* of the public papers.

On Mr. Milner's reply, in which there is a dissertation on Bishop Hoadley's principles and writings, letters were written, and deputations sent to some Members of Parliament. Sir Henry Mildmay brings in a Bill for the suppression of *Monastic Institutions*, the very words of Doctor Sturges. One would imagine that there was a kind of confederacy amongst some of the editors of the public papers to ring the alarm. Not a single paragraph could I have seen in any of them in contradiction to exaggerated falsehoods. *Two thousand of the common people, chiefly servant maids, were converted by the French Clergy in one part of London, in the space of two years;* that is to say, more than all the Catholic Clergy of England have converted since the reign of Elizabeth.

The French clergy, mostly half starved and half naked poor people, in spite of the generosity of government, on account of the smallness of their allowance, and the dearth of provisions, are ill qualified for making converts. They sleep five or six, or by trios, in poor places that cannot

* Others are of opinion, that de Mapes is not the author.

afford to have servant maids: they do not know English—servant maids do not know French. These poor priests make their own beds, and cook their own soup and vegetables. I have preached in the chapels in London near twelve years, and I have not reconciled one single servant maid to the Catholic Church. More of them are debauched in London in one month, than will be converted in ten thousand years. It were much better they were converted than cast on the town: and little would the state suffer if a London cinder-woman embraced the religion of so many empresses and queens.

Popery is increasing in the diocese of Chester, said another, where forty thousand three hundred and thirty-three persons never go to any religious worship. But Popery increases under the influence of fifty thousand Priests, all men of talents. That is to say, more Priests than all the Bishops of Europe have ordained in twenty years. Such are the methods used to prepare the way for the operation of a bill which has for its object a restraint on the freedom of the will of a Catholic woman, who perhaps if she lived in the world would bring scandal on her family.

There cannot, my Lords, be any monastic institutions in England under the existing laws, if there were as many women who would live in celibacy as there are bad women in London. For a monastic institution requires a monastery endowed, and the sanction of the laws of the state to render the vows of the religious irrevocable; as in Catholic countries, where, if a priest marries, or a religious deserts his cloister, he is punished by the civil magistrate, or sent back to his superior to be punished as an apostate. Hence, when the monastic institutions were dissolved in England, the vow of celibacy still remained. And Henry the Eighth, who sent the Lady Abbess's gold cross to the mint, would have doomed her body to the fagot or halter, had he perceived the bridal ring on her finger.

The Legislature of ninety-one made this distinction in the toleration granted to the Catholics: it removed the penalties which attached to those who would enter into any ecclesiastical community of the church of Rome, but not to extend to monastic institutions; that is to say, not to endow monasteries, or incorporate their rules, such as they are in

Catholic countries, with the laws of the state, where they are never to marry, nor return to the world: whereas here they are at liberty to renounce their vows when they think fit, and sue for their share of their family inheritance, not being here as elsewhere, dead in law. What are then the few English nuns now in England, or the few Irish nuns in Ireland, for no ladies of any other country devote themselves there to a religious life? What are they in the eyes of the law? What are they in the eyes of any man who pays the slightest attention to the subject? *A few Catholic females, who, from devotion, form a resolution to die old maids, and, when tired of celibacy, can marry in spite of Pope or Bishop,* as there are some clergymen in this kingdom and in Ireland, who, after officiating at Catholic altars, have taken wives to themselves, and exchanged sacerdotal cincture for the cestus of Venus.

If these ladies were ladies of pleasure seducing youth; the gentlemen of Winchester would not give themselves the slightest concern about them. They are of the greatest use to the Catholic nobility and gentry, who send their daughters to be educated by them, on account of the strictness of their morals, their seclusion from the dissipations of the world, which affords them the more time to superintend the instruction of their scholars, and the facility of observing the spiritual exercises peculiar to the Catholic religion, such as fasts, abstinence, confessions, communications, &c. which could not be observed at other boarding schools; and which, though they may appear ridiculous to others, are held sacred by us. In Galway, in Ireland, there are ladies of this description, since the conversion of the kingdom to Christianity in the fourth century. The parliament, however rigorous in angry times, never molested them, on account of their utility, by their instructions, besides the policy of spending their money in the country. For if there were not ladies of this description in the country, the Catholics would send their daughters to be educated abroad.

But the nuns of this country pervert the children of Protestants, and the French Clergy make converts.

Every inquiry has been made, and the challenge given to prove the allegation. The inquiry proved fruitless, and the challenge refused. Upon inquiry it was found, that a Scotch lady and gentleman, going to some distant part,

left their child in the care of these religious women, until their return. They could not have left her in better hands; for some of these ladies make a vow to attend the sick, without distinction between Turk and Christian. Parents have a right to leave their children where they think fit. They take no Protestant boarders or scholars. They had at their school two young misses, whose father was a Catholic, and the mother a Protestant. A father has a natural right over his children. For this reason we never baptize the children of Quakers or Jews, without the consent of their fathers. If they were dying, beyond hope of recovery, we would not scruple to baptize, for death emancipates them. The father, whose name was Counsellor Sheridan, died last year: the mother took the children from Winchester, and sent them to a Protestant boarding-school. It was also found upon inquiry, that an Irish regiment, in which there are a great many Catholic soldiers, was quartered at Winchester. By an act of the Irish Legislature, the Catholics of Ireland can enter into the army, and make an open profession of their faith, and perform their religious worship. A brave man, who exposes his life for his king and country, is entitled to the privilege of saying his prayers. The Abbot of Saint Galles, a Dominican Friar, and Sovereign Prince, has Calvinist regiments, and Calvinist chaplains in his service; and as there are such numbers of Irish Catholics in his Majesty's armies, but especially in the navy, an edifying Catholic chaplain would contribute greatly to prevent amongst them the contagion of immorality and Jacobinism. For when they do not practise their own religion, they will practise no other. Upon those principles, a very worthy French clergyman, who has acquired some smattering of English, instilled into the minds of those Catholic soldiers the principles of loyalty, morality, and good order. And such, my Lords, is the ground of all this clamour about *Nuns, Conversions, and Popery.*

As to conversions—one Catholic lady, of an edifying life and amiable manners in the world, would make more converts than ten thousand cloisters. And of all religions on earth the Catholic religion is the least calculated for making converts in these kingdoms, on account of the severity of its rules. It is not such an easy matter to prevail on a voluptuary to fast and pray; or a libertine to renounce his crimi-

nal pleasures; or a usurer, and others accustomed to accumulate a fortune by unlawful means, to make restitution of ill-acquired gain; or a married man, who has an unfaithful wife, to live as chaste as a vestal in a cloister, until he buries or takes her back to his bosom. These and other sacrifices must be made, after being instructed in every essential point of the Catholic doctrine. All the sins which the new convert can recollect must be told in the tribunal of penance, where the concealment of one would be a sacrilege.

Let the sectaries who daily spring up preach this doctrine —their meeting-houses will be deserted. It is an easy matter to work on the imagination, and to pass from one belief to another, when a person has no fixed standard or rule: but to change the heart, to triumph over the passions, to hate whatever we loved before, to love what we hated, is not a change so easily wrought. Let not then the Church of England, or the Prebendaries of Winchester, be alarmed with the number of conversions made by nuns, or Catholic missionaries—we have more than enough to do, in keeping our own flocks attentive to their duty. And, unfortunately, with regard to several of them, we can say with the prophet, in vain have I laboured. Tom Paine has made more converts in the three kingdoms in three years, than the Catholic clergy will make in twenty thousand.

It would be happy for the kingdom if we could convert all the Infidels and fanatics that separate every day from the established religion, and who, if an opportunity offered, would bury it with the state in its ruins, as in Cromwell's time. In one place of worship Christ is expunged out of their creed. In another, the Father and Holy Ghost are denied, and Christ is all—the Father and Holy Ghost are but his attributes. The Catholic priest, who believes more of the Thirty-nine Articles, than all the sectaries in England, is doomed by law to death, if he makes of a Quaker a child of the covenant by baptism; or prevails on an infidel to pray to Christ who died for him. If the Tiber overflows its banks, if the Nile sinks below its usual level, if the plague destroys, if famine devours, said Tertullian, the cry is, to the lions with the Christians.*—The Catholic is the only obnoxious being.

Ireland, my Lords, this instant resembles a sea agitated

* Christianos ad leonem.

after a violent storm. The most distant idea of the slightest penalty on the score of conscience, must alarm the Catholics of that kingdom; and give an opportunity to others to represent to them, that the British Parliament closing with a new penal law, is but the scene of a tragedy in which one act leads to another more distressing; that is to say, that this is but a preliminary to some other law more oppressive, when the Imperial Parliament meets, and themselves are friendless on a distant shore; whereas, if in the Irish Parliament there were members hostile to their interests, there were others who pleaded their cause; and thus, instead of an enlargement of privileges they will have nothing to expect but an extension of penalties; such will be the language of the enemies to the Union.

I know not, my Lords, whether this paper will fall into your hands before the Bill is disposed of. If it be already passed into a law, I disclaim any intention whatever to censure the proceedings of the Legislature of the land, but shall, as in duty bound, submit to its decisions. But if it be pending before the house, self-defence will, I hope, justify me in deprecating what I think obnoxious, and will answer, in my opinion, no end but that of creating distrust and despondency.

In an age of profligacy, when so many wise and virtuous Members of the Legislature, intended to introduce a new law for the security of the marriage bed; when divorces, instead of constant affection, are the frequent fruits of matrimony: amidst so many seminaries of lewdness, and cities become, on account of vice and corruption, so many criminal Ninivites, which would require a Jonas to induce them to repent in sackcloth and ashes; streets infested with lewd females from the age of eleven to the period at which the effects of a crime that carries with it its own punishment, and the enormous number of which wretches, a magistrate who has written a book on the Police of London, computes at fifty thousand annually! Amidst such scenes of vice, is the chastity of a few Catholic women an object of so alarming a nature, as to deserve the attention of the first Senate on earth, especially as it is in their power to renounce their state of celibacy when they choose? Perhaps not two hundred of them would bind themselves to a single life,

in the space of fifty years. If their number were multiplied to ten times, or to a thousand times more, what are they when compared to the great number of the immoral and unchaste all over England? About twenty or thirty atoms floating on the surface of an immense ocean. *Rari nantes in-gurgite vasto.*

Were it the custom amongst Quakers, Anabaptists, Moravians, or any other sect or description of people, to have women of a solitary cast or disposition of mind amongst them, who from fanaticism or inclination, would choose to lead a retired life, and superintend the education of the females of their sects, Sir Henry Mildmay would rather admire than molest them. Why then harass, perplex, expose to the insults of domiciliary visits, persons of the Catholic persuasion? Why, amongst such a variety of sects, single the Catholics out as the objects of persecution? There are now no Catholic Pretenders to the Throne; when there were, not one of the Catholics of Ireland joined them, although they raised the standard twice in Scotland, to assert their claim to the British Empire. The Pope, from a temporal Prince, is reduced to his primitive state of a pious and edifying Bishop, when he was powerfully armed with Peter's keys in one hand, and Paul's sword in the other; when in consequence of temporal claims, such as Peter's-pence, &c. the gifts of former Kings, the exercise and authority which seemed to encroach upon the civil power; the Catholics of these kingdoms adhered to their allegiance, and repaired to the banners of their Sovereign. All former pretexts for persecution being done away, what cause is there for persecuting us now? It must be this pretended creed which fanaticism or prejudice has fathered, and which our hearts and actions disclaim. Priests selling absolutions for all sorts of crimes, and millions of Catholics deprived of their civil rights on the score of conscience buying them. For where there is no purchase, there is no sale.

Are we not Adam's children? Have not the Catholics the same sensations of pain and pleasure as other men? Their vices and virtues do not they run in the same channel with those of their Protestant neighbours? Are they not animated with the same desire of glory—allured by the

blandishments of pleasure—courted by the charms of riches—as earnestly inclined to the enjoyment of ease and opulence? If perjury be their creed, if their clergy be endued with the magic power of sanctifying crimes, and wafting their flocks to heaven on the wings of unrepented guilt, why do not they glide down the stream of legal liberty, instead of stemming the torrent of oppression? Why do not they qualify themselves for sitting in the Senate, and giving laws to the land, in concert with their countrymen, instead of being the continual objects of penal statutes.

It is that they are diametrically the reverse of what they are represented. Their religion forbids them to sport with the awful name of the Divinity. They do not choose to impose on their neighbours or themselves by perjury. Were it otherwise—were their consciences of a more ductile texture, in three weeks or a month's time they would all read their recantations, and be on a level with the rest of their fellow subjects. Yet the archives of national justice can prove, that the Catholics of Ireland, reduced to the necessity of discovering against themselves, preferred the loss of their estates to the guilt of perjury, when a false oath could have secured them in their property. Notwithstanding this imputed creed, they prefer the smarting afflictions of the body to the stinging remorses of the soul: and when worldly prosperities stand in competition with conscience, they rather choose to be its martyrs than executioners.

I have the honour to be, &c.

ARTHUR O'LEARY.

No. 46, *Half-moon Street, Piccadilly.*
June 30, 1800.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01073 6223